**From Houses to Homes:
An Archaeological Case Study of
Household Formation at the Utopia Slave Quarter,
ca. 1675 to 1775**

Garrett Randall Fesler
Williamsburg, Virginia

B. A., University of California, Santa Cruz, 1986
M. A., College of William and Mary, 1991

A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Anthropology

University of Virginia
May 2004

Adrian LaViolette

Frederick D. Ham

Patricia Walton

Eric P. Nelson

© Copyright by
Garrett Randall Fesler
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
May 2004

ABSTRACT

The Utopia Quarter archaeological site is located on a bluff overlooking the James River a few miles outside the town of Williamsburg, Virginia. Four different groups of enslaved Africans and their descendants lived at the site between ca. 1675 and ca. 1775. Although historical archaeologists have devoted a great deal of effort excavating slave quarter sites over the past few decades, few of these studies have focused on the types of households and families slaves created. The current theory holds that enslaved Africans gradually developed simple and extended families, and this is not in dispute here.

This dissertation focuses on the rate of growth, the condition, and the character of households and families at the Utopia Quarter, and also studies these issues in the wider Chesapeake region. Three types of archaeological data are used to test and explore household and family formation processes at Utopia. First, I expect to find slave housing units decrease in size over time to accommodate increasingly smaller family groups. Furthermore, I propose that the number of sub-floor pits will diminish as well, as family members became more inclined to share storage spaces. Thirdly, I examine selected assemblages of artifacts in an effort to identify consumption patterns that signify families, finding that well organized households were more efficient units of consumption than unorganized coresident groups. In a related matter, I isolate collections of artifacts that I argue are associated with and generated by women or men, to identify those housing units with a balance of both sexes, and those that predominantly consist of one gender.

The pattern I identify is that slave housing units grew smaller, the number of sub-floor pits decreased, and artifact collections changed with time both at Utopia and the greater Chesapeake, largely, I argue, in response to the growth of families.

© Copyright by
Garrett Randall Fesler
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

May 2004

ABSTRACT

The Utopia Quarter archaeological site is located on a bluff overlooking the James River a few miles outside the town of Williamsburg, Virginia. Four different groups of enslaved Africans and their descendants lived at the site between ca. 1675 and ca. 1775. Although historical archaeologists have devoted a great deal of effort excavating slave quarter sites over the past few decades, few of these studies have focused on the types of households and families slaves created. The current theory holds that enslaved Africans gradually developed simple and extended families, and this is not in dispute here.

This dissertation focuses on the rate of growth, the condition, and the character of households and families at the Utopia Quarter, and also studies these issues in the wider Chesapeake region. Three types of archaeological data are used to test and explore household and family formation processes at Utopia. First, I expect to find slave housing units decrease in size over time to accommodate increasingly smaller family groups. Furthermore, I propose that the number of sub-floor pits will diminish as well, as family members became more inclined to share storage spaces. Thirdly, I examine selected assemblages of artifacts in an effort to identify consumption patterns that signify families, finding that well organized households were more efficient units of consumption than unorganized coresident groups. In a related matter, I isolate collections of artifacts that I argue are associated with and generated by women or men, to identify those housing units with a balance of both sexes, and those that predominantly consist of one gender.

The pattern I identify is that slave housing units grew smaller, the number of sub-floor pits decreased, and artifact assemblages changed with time both at Utopia and the greater Chesapeake, largely, I argue, in response to the growth of families.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Table of Figures	v
Table of Tables	x
Dedication	xiii
Acknowledgements	xiv
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Chapter II: The Making of the Slave Family and Household	35
Chapter III: The Context of Household and Family at Utopia.	63
Chapter IV: History of the Utopia Quarter	98
Chapter V: Historical Archaeology at the Utopia Quarter	149
Chapter VI: Architectural Change and the Slave Family.	217
Chapter VII: Sub-Floor Pits and the Slave Family.	280
Chapter VIII: Artifact Assemblages and the Slave Family.	351
Chapter IX: Retrospection and Conclusions, the Slave Family at Utopia.	402
Appendix A: Thomas Pettus's Inventory, 1691	420
Appendix B: Deed Releasing Littleton/Utopia to James Bray, 1700	422
Appendix C: Will of James Bray, November 18, 1725	425
Appendix D: Personal Property Tax Lists for Lewis Burwell IV in 1782 and 1783	432
Appendix E: Chesapeake Slave Quarter Site Comparative Dataset	434
Bibliography	437

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Location of the Utopia Quarter in the state of Virginia and on the Virginia Peninsula.....	25
Figure 1.2.	Location of Utopia Quarter, Pettus, Bray, and Burwell plantations on the U.S.G.S. quadrangle map (Hog Island 1984)	26
Figure 1.3.	Illustration of changes in architecture, sub-floor pits, and artifacts over time at Utopia.....	27
Figure 1.4.	Overview map of development at Kingsmill on the James as of 1995	28
Figure 1.5.	Topography, major drainages, and modern highways in relation to the Kingsmill area.....	29
Figure 1.6.	Place names in the vicinity of Kingsmill, Virginia, in the 17th century	30
Figure 1.7.	Location of historic sites at Kingsmill on the James property	31
Figure 1.8.	Map of the Utopia Quarter site based upon findings in 1973-74 (Kelso 1984:73)	32
Figure 1.9.	The Utopia Quarter site as designated as five interrelated sites.....	33
Figure 1.10	Location of core occupation areas at the Utopia Quarter site	34
Figure 3.1	Graph of historical eras of development in relation to Utopia occupation periods	97
Figure 4.1.	Conjectural reconstruction of the layout of the 1,280-acre Littletown/Utopia plantation (U.S.G.S. Hog Island 1984)	143
Figure 4.2.	Location of James Bray II's holdings in the vicinity of Utopia (U.S.G.S. Hog Island 1984)	144
Figure 4.3.	Owners of property in the vicinity of Utopia ca. 1751 (U.S.G.S. Hog Island 1984)	145
Figure 4.4.	Plan du débarquement et la Marche de la division Commandee par le Mr. de Simon (Anonymous 1781)	146
Figure 4.5.	Carte de la compagne faite en Virginie en 1781 (Pechon 1781).....	147
Figure 4.6.	Carte des Environs de Williamsburg en Virginie (Desandrouin 1781).....	148

Figure 5.1. Map of archaeological components related to Period 1 occupation at Utopia (ca. 1675-1700)	187
Figure 5.2. Conjectural drawing of the main dwelling house at Period 1 Utopia (Kelso 1984:75)	188
Figure 5.3. Overview of half cellar under main dwelling house at Period 1 Utopia, facing southwest.....	189
Figure 5.4. Interior of half cellar at Period 1 Utopia, facing west	189
Figure 5.5. Upper layers of well at Period 1 Utopia, facing west.....	190
Figure 5.6. Profile of well at Period 1 Utopia, facing west	190
Figure 5.7. Artifacts arrayed around bisected oval trash pit at Period 1 Utopia	191
Figure 5.8. Plan and profile of oval trash pit at Period 1 Utopia	191
Figure 5.9. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 1 Utopia	192
Figure 5.10. Ceramic type date range intersection as determined by Kelso (1984)	192
Figure 5.11. Period 1 ceramic type date range based on the entire ceramic collection	193
Figure 5.12. Period 1 ceramic type date range with intrusive well layers removed	193
Figure 5.13. Period 1 Utopia timeline with dating formulas	194
Figure 5.14. Map of archaeological components of Period 2 occupation at Utopia	195
Figure 5.15. Excavation of FE36, a large sub-floor pit in Structure 10.....	196
Figure 5.16. Overview of the compound of dwellings at Period 2 Utopia, facing north	196
Figure 5.17. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 2 Utopia	197
Figure 5.18. Ceramic type date range intersection from sealed contexts, Period 2 Utopia	198
Figure 5.19. Adjusted ceramic type date range intersection from sealed contexts, Period 2 Utopia	198
Figure 5.20. Period 2 Utopia timeline with dating formulas	199

	vii
Figure 5.21. Map of archaeological components of Period 3 occupation at Utopia	200
Figure 5.22. Overview of Structure 40 with three sub-floor pits inside, facing east	201
Figure 5.23. Overview of Structure 50 with 18 sub-floor pits, facing southeast	201
Figure 5.24. Southwest view of Trash Pits 62, 119, and 127 located near Structure 40	202
Figure 5.25. Overview of Trash Pit 61 located near Structure 50, facing south-southeast	202
Figure 5.26. Period 3 Utopia timeline with dating formulas	203
Figure 5.27. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 3 Utopia	204
Figure 5.28. Ceramic type production intersections from sealed contexts, Period 3 Utopia	205
Figure 5.29. Adjusted ceramic type production intersections from sealed contexts, Period 3 Utopia	205
Figure 5.30. Map of Utopia burial ground	206
Figure 5.31. Clay tobacco pipe in Burial KM316 and bead necklace in Burial 69	207
Figure 5.32. Map of archaeological components of Period 4 occupation at Utopia	208
Figure 5.33. Overview of sub-floor pits inside Structure 140	209
Figure 5.34. Excavation of Sub-Floor Pit 9 located inside Structure 140	209
Figure 5.35. Excavation of Borrow Pit 21-28 as divided into eight sections	210
Figure 5.36. Period 4 Utopia timeline with dating formulas	211
Figure 5.37. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 4 Utopia	212
Figure 5.38. Ceramic type production date range intersection for Period 4 Utopia	213
Figure 5.39. Timeline of occupation at the Utopia Quarter with dating formulas applied	214

Figure 5.40. English clay tobacco pipestem histogram for the four occupation periods at the Utopia Quarter	215
Figure 5.41. Prospective chart of conditions for family development at Utopia compared to the overall Chesapeake	216
Figure 6.1. Main housing unit (KM306/KM308), the Utopia Cottage, Period 1 Utopia.....	266
Figure 6.2. Tobacco barn, Structure 70, Period 1 Utopia	267
Figure 6.3. Structure 1 housing unit, Period 2 Utopia	268
Figure 6.4. Housing unit, Structure 10, Period 2 Utopia	269
Figure 6.5. Housing unit, Structure 20, Period 2 Utopia	270
Figure 6.6. Service building, Structure KM307, Period 2 Utopia	271
Figure 6.7. Housing unit, Structure 40, Period 3 Utopia	272
Figure 6.8. Housing unit, Structure 50, Period 3 Utopia	273
Figure 6.9. Service building, Structure 107, Period 3 Utopia.....	274
Figure 6.10. Housing units, Duplex 1 and Duplex 2, Structure 140, Period 4 Utopia ..	275
Figure 6.11. Housing units, Structures 150 and 160, Period 4 Utopia	276
Figure 6.12. Location of comparative Chesapeake slave sites	277
Figure 6.13. Box-and-dot plot for 67 Chesapeake slave housing units as expressed in square feet	278
Figure 6.14. Box-and-dot plot for square root transformed dataset of 67 Chesapeake slave housing units.....	278
Figure 6.15. Chart of mean and median housing unit size over time for 67 cases and 61 trimmed mean cases	279
Figure 7.1. <i>In situ</i> artifacts on the floor of Sub-Floor Pit 355 at Kingsmill Quarter	342
Figure 7.2. Excavation of Sub-Floor Pit 5, Period 4 Utopia, a possible cold storage pit.....	342

Figure 7.3. Sub-Floor Pit 36 during excavation, facing west	343
Figure 7.4. Evidence of wood lining and in-situ strap hinge in Sub-Floor Pit 36	343
Figure 7.5. Profile of Sub-Floor Pit 36 and Pit 37, facing west.....	344
Figure 7.6. Profile of Sub-Floor Pit 21, facing north.....	345
Figure 7.7. Profile of Sub-Floor Pit 21, facing north.....	346
Figure 7.8. Phasing of sub-floor pitting in Structure 140, Duplex 1 and 2.....	347
Figure 7.9. <i>In situ</i> artifacts on the floor of Sub-Floor Pit 19, possible primary refuse...	348
Figure 7.10. Box-and-dot plot of sub-floor pits in 73 Chesapeake slave housing units	349
Figure 7.11. Box-and-dot plot for the square root transformed sub-floor pits in 73 Chesapeake slave housing units	349
Figure 7.12. Chart of mean, trimmed mean, and median SFPs per housing unit	350
Figure 8.1. Hypothetical effects of the transtion from coresident groups to Households	396
Figure 8.2. Rates of consumption of selected goods per occupation period.....	397
Figure 8.3. Rates of resource consumption per housing unit, by percentage	398
Figure 8.4. Rates of resource consumption per housing unit, by rank.....	398
Figure 8.5. Ratio of resource consumption goods per feature volume	399
Figure 8.6. Percentages of women's artifacts by type	399
Figure 8.7. Percentages of women's artifacts from Utopia's ten housing units	400
Figure 8.8. Percentages of men's artifacts by type	400
Figure 8.9. Percentages of men's artifacts from Utopia's ten housing units	401
Figure 8.10. Differences between men's and women's artifacts in eight of Utopia's housing units	401
Table 5.1. Historic features associated with Period 3 occupation at Utopia	163

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1.1. Chronology of the four occupation periods at the Utopia Quarter	7
Table 3.1. The growth of 17th- and 18th-century Chesapeake slave families as charted by recent historians	83
Table 3.2. Housing unit composition for selected Chesapeake plantations.....	91
Table 3.3. Housing unit composition for Robert Carter's slaves, 1733.....	93
Table 4.1. Partial list of slaves and servants owned by Thomas Pettus II in 1691	105
Table 4.2. Nine quarter farms owned by James Bray II in 1725, including Littletown	110
Table 4.3. Enslaved staff working at six of James Bray's outlying quarter farms in 1725	111
Table 4.4. Enslaved staff working at Littletown, Debb's, and Jacko's in 1725	116
Table 4.5. List of slaves belonging to James Bray III that were transferred to the ownership of his widow Frances Thacker Bray in 1745	125
Table 4.6. Lewis Burwell IV's moveable taxable property in 1782.....	136
Table 4.7. Lewis Burwell IV's moveable taxable property in 1783.....	136
Table 5.1. Historic features related to activity at the Utopia Quarter	150
Table 5.2. Historic features related to activity at the Utopia Quarter, by period	151
Table 5.3. Artifact totals from the Utopia Quarter, per occupation period	152
Table 5.4. Historic features associated with Period 1 occupation at Utopia	153
Table 5.5. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 1 Utopia	156
Table 5.6. Historic features associated with Period 2 occupation at Utopia	159
Table 5.7. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 2 Utopia	160
Table 5.8. Mean date for identifiable Period 2 Utopia ceramic sherds	161
Table 5.9. Historic features associated with Period 3 occupation at Utopia	163

Table 5.10. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 3 Utopia.....	165
Table 5.11. Mean date for identifiable Period 3 Utopia ceramic sherds.....	167
Table 5.12. Human burial features associated with Period 3 (and possibly Period 4) occupation at Utopia	170
Table 5.13. Vital statistics for the Utopia burial ground population	173
Table 5.14. Historic features associated with Period 4 occupation at Utopia.....	177
Table 5.15. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 4 Utopia.....	179
Table 5.16. Mean date for identifiable Period 4 Utopia ceramic sherds.....	181
Table 6.1. Architecture at the Utopia Quarter, ca. 1675 – ca. 1775	232
Table 6.2. Average Utopia housing unit size, by period.....	254
Table 6.3. Descriptive statistics for housing unit size (in square feet)	256
Table 6.4. Frequencies for nominal categories for period of occupation	257
Table 6.5. Summary of housing unit size for Period A	259
Table 6.6. ANOVA tests for housing unit size, Periods B, C, and D	260
Table 6.7. ANOVA tests for housing unit size, Periods E, F, and G.....	261
Table 6.8. ANOVA tests for housing unit size, Periods H and I	261
Table 7.1. Sub-floor pit totals in nine housing units at the Utopia Quarter.....	304
Table 7.2. Sub-floor pits at the Utopia Quarter, Period 2, ca. 1700 – ca. 1730	305
Table 7.3. Sub-floor pits at the Utopia Quarter, Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750.....	313
Table 7.4. Sub-floor pits at the Utopia Quarter, Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775.....	319
Table 7.5. Utopia sub-floor pits grouped by elements of form.....	328
Table 7.6. Sub-floor pit profiles for housing units at the Utopia Quarter.....	330
Table 7.7. Sub-floor pit totals at Utopia, by period	332

Table 7.8. Descriptive statistics for sub-floor pits per housing unit	334
Table 7.9. Summary of sub-floor pit counts per housing unit for Period A	335
Table 7.10. ANOVA tests for sub-floor pits in Periods B, C, and D.....	336
Table 7.11. ANOVA tests for sub-floor pits in Periods E, F, and G	337
Table 7.12. ANOVA tests for sub-floor pits in Periods H and I.....	338
Table 8.1. Artifact types and sub-groups representing resource consumption	361
Table 8.2. Expected abundances of resource consumption groups	367
Table 8.3. Distribution of subgrouped resource consumption artifacts among Utopia's four occupation periods.....	368
Table 8.4. Distribution of resource consumption artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units	371
Table 8.5. Ranks of resource consumption artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units	372
Table 8.6. Distribution of subgroup artifacts among the Period 2 housing units	374
Table 8.7. Distribution of subgroup artifacts among the Period 3 housing units	375
Table 8.8. Distribution of subgroup artifacts among the Period 4 housing units	376
Table 8.9. Artifact types associated with women's and men's activities	382
Table 8.10. Distribution of women's artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units	386
Table 8.11. Distribution of men's artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units	388
Table 8.12. Proportion of artifact types within eight housing units at Utopia.....	389
Table 8.13. Weighted proportions of artifact types within eight housing units at Utopia.....	389
Table 8.14. Weighted proportions of women's and men's artifacts within eight housing units at Utopia	390
Table 9.1. A synopsis of residency patterns as determined by architecture, sub-floor pits, and consumption/gender patterns	403

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of archaeology is all about the people, both past and present. Excavation is truly a collective effort and my work on the Utopia project has been both scholarly and social. Dozens upon dozens of people have been involved in the archaeological study of Utopia over the years. The contributions to the project range across the spectrum, from the generous funding provided by Busch Properties, Inc., to friendly neighbors bringing out cold drinks on a hot summer afternoon. Every bit, however big or small, helped push the excavation forward. And it seems a bit unfair that I get to take much of the credit for the project. The project, and this dissertation, could never have been completed without the advice, guidance, expertise, physical labor, and financial support of the many people and institutions listed below.

In Memory of James F. Deetz

First and foremost, the only reason archaeological excavations at Utopia began in 1993 was because of the interest, commitment, and financial backing offered by the owners of the site, Busch Properties, Inc. They had no legal obligation to pursue archaeological study at Utopia, yet Busch was one of the project's most enthusiastic proponents. In particular, Joe Cross, Bill Voliva, Tom Duan, George Matthews, and a host of employees and contractors affiliated with Busch Properties spearheaded the effort to excavate Utopia.

Secondly, without the determination and vision of archaeologists Nick Luccketti and Bill Kehoe to initiate an excavation at Utopia, the site might have been overlooked. Both Nick and Bill coordinated efforts to fund the excavation, and then entrusted me with the responsibility to excavate the site. For that opportunity I will always be grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of archaeology is all about the people, both past and present. Excavation is truly a collective effort and my work on the Utopia project has been both scholarly and social. Dozens upon dozens of people have been involved in the archaeological study of Utopia over the years. The contributions to the project range across the spectrum, from the generous funding provided by Busch Properties, Inc., to friendly neighbors bringing out cold drinks on a hot summer afternoon. Every bit, however big or small, helped push the excavation forward. And it seems a bit unfair that I get to take much of the credit for the project. The project, and this dissertation, could never have been completed without the advice, guidance, expertise, physical labor, and financial support of the many people and institutions listed below.

First and foremost, the only reason archaeological excavations at Utopia began in 1993 was because of the interest, commitment, and financial backing offered by the owners of the site, Busch Properties, Inc. They had no legal obligation to pursue archaeological study at Utopia, yet Busch was one of the project's most enthusiastic proponents. In particular, Joe Cross, Bill Voliva, Tom Dunn, George Matthews, and a host of employees and contractors affiliated with Busch Properties spearheaded the effort to excavate Utopia.

Secondly, without the determination and vision of archeologists Nick Lucchetti and Bill Kelso to initiate an excavation at Utopia, the site might have been overlooked. Both Nick and Bill coordinated efforts to fund the excavation, and then entrusted me with the responsibility to excavate the site. For that opportunity I will always be grateful.

Third, the archaeological staff and crew of the James River Institute for Archaeology moved literally tons of dirt over the years. Through several field seasons, the number of people who devoted time and energy excavating the site numbers in the scores. While I supervised the entirety of the excavation, at times on-site supervisory duties fell on the shoulders of Jamie May, and to a lesser degree, David Givens, Matt Laird, Will Moore, and Jeff Fleisher.

The following people worked at the site: Tom Beaman (1995), Bill Buckner (1993-1994), Laura Croghan (1995), Teresa Farkas (1994-1996), Jeff Fleisher (1995), Dave Givens (1993-1996), Kevin Goodrich (1993), Liz Grzymala, Paul Johnson (1995), Matt Laird (1995-1996), Annette Loomis (1993-1995), Dane Magoon (1993-1995), Seth Mallios (1995), Veronika Martin (1993), Jamie May (1993-1995), Brad McDonald (1993-1996), Perry McSherry (1993-1994), Will Moore (1993-1995), Brett Nachman (1995), Tracy Norcutt (1993-1995), John Risetto (1995), Corine Sprigle (1995-1996), Charles Thomas (1995), Abby Turowski (1995), Lucy Vinciguerra (1995), Derek Wheeler (1995), Tara Winters (1994-1996), and Kim Zawicki (1995).

Bly Straube, Fiona Bessey, Sherrie Beaver, Robert Dunkerley, and Matsi Washburn all helped in varying capacities with the laboratory work. Jennifer West (1993) and Diane Masters (1994-1996) handled office management duties and computer support throughout the project and Diane designed the Access database onto which the artifacts were catalogued. Annette Loomis, Corine Sprigle, and Tara Winters, helped process the soil collected for floatation, while Chip Cunningham, Karisa Jacobsen, Don Gaylord, Robert Dunkerley, and Diane Masters assisted in sorting portions of the heavy fraction material. Craig Chartier analyzed the faunal remains. Patricia Samford devoted

several weeks of her time cataloguing the artifacts recovered from many of the storage pits for inclusion in her own dissertation, a work that has been an invaluable resource for me. Tricia also arranged to have phytolith and pollen research on several of the sub-floor pits. Elliott Jordan and Jamie May assisted with the production of maps and computer graphics early on until I got a handle of the process. Martha Katz-Hyman at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation arranged for some of the artifacts to be photographed.

Several archaeology field schools visited the site and helped dig: the 1995 Monticello field school; the 1995 Poplar Forest field school; the 1995 Venable Lane field school; the 1994 and 1995 Christopher Newport University field school; and the 1993, 1994, and 1995 Jamestown Rediscovery/APVA field school. In 1995 the staff from the Mount Vernon Archaeology Department spent several days working at the site as well.

The legion of scholars who have given advice, pointed toward resources, or thoughtfully pondered the evidence is quite large, and includes: Anna Agbe-Davies, Mary Beaudry, Alison Bell, Dennis Blanton, Joanne Bowen, Cliff Boyd, Donna Boyd, Greg Brown, Marley Brown, Ed Chappell, Eric Deetz, Jim Deetz, Trish Deetz-Scott, Wyone Edwards-Ingram, Jeff Fleisher, Maria Franklin, Jillian Galle, Don Gaylord, David Givens, Willie Graham, Liz Gryzmala, Jerry Handler, Dave Hazard, Barbara Heath, Martha Katz-Hyman, Bill Kelso, Susan Kern, Heather Lapham, Carl Lounsbury, Nick Lucchetti, Seth Mallios, Jamie May, Larry McKee, Steve Mrozowski, Fraser Neiman, Ivor Noel Hume, Doug Owsley, Drake Patten, Bill Pittman, Dennis Pogue, Tonia Rock, Patricia Samford, Doug Sanford, Ann Smart-Martin, Sarah Stroud, Lorena Walsh, Derek Wheeler, and Esther White. All these people, and many others whom surely I have inadvertently overlooked, helped mold and shape my thinking on Utopia.

As for the dissertation, my committee picked me up off the floor several times. Adria LaViolette was kind enough to step into the Chair's position upon the untimely death in November 2000 of my original Chair, Jim Deetz. Like so many, Jim was the reason why I became an archaeologist, and losing him forced me to reevaluate my life and my project. Thanks to Adria's support I was eventually able to get momentum going again. In the process she has become a trusted friend and source of inspiration, and I am lucky to have her looking over my shoulder and going to bat for me.

I often find myself standing in awe of Frasier Neiman's intellect, and I am humbled by the fact that he considers me a colleague and a friend. It was Fraser's idea to focus on family and household at Utopia, and I only hope that he finds this final product a worthy effort. From the beginning Pati Wattenmaker has made sure that I never lost sight of the fact that the dissertation had to be about "the data, data, data." And I looked to her work on households for encouragement. Louis Nelson was gracious enough to become the outside reader from the Architectural History Department, and I value his extensive knowledge of all things architectural.

My colleagues at the James River Institute for Archaeology—Nick Lucchetti, Matt Laird, and Carol Tyrer—shouldered my workload on several occasions in 2002 and 2003 to allow me to write. My mother Janet Fesler took several weeks of her time to help with childcare in October 2003 which was extremely helpful. And my wife Corine Sprigle and young daughter Ella have been a source of inspiration.

This dissertation centers on charting the development of families and households at Utopia, and during my years of work on the project I started my own family and set up our household. The relative stability and security that my family provides for me stands

in stark contrast to the conditions that families and households endured at Utopia. This sobering realization was never far from my mind, especially when I hold my daughter Ella in my arms and tell her she is safe and loved, and know that parents living at Utopia loved their children just as much but could not guarantee their safety.

Sidney Mintz (1974:14)

Historical archaeologists studying enslaved Africans and their descendants only rarely have focused their attention on the types of households and families that enslaved peoples formed. The composition of households and the stability of families that enslaved Africans¹ were able to create has been debated among historians, sociologists, and anthropologists for more than 50 years, generating a sizeable literature on the subject (see Frazier 1930, 1939 [2001]; Stampp 1956; Myrdal 1964; Rainwater and Yancey 1967; Billingsley 1963; On Bois 1968 [1969]; Staples 1971; 1973; Blassingame 1972; Hill 1973; Fogel and Engerman 1974; Furstenberg, Hershberg, and Modell 1975; Elkins 1976; Gearhart 1976; Gannan 1976; Kulikoff 1977a, 1978; Norton et al. 1983; Sobel 1987; Malone 1992; Mintz and Price 1992; Robertson 1996; Stevenson 1996a; Walsh 1997; Morgan 1998:498-558; Paterson 1998). Yet for the most part, historical archaeologists have all but ignored the issue of slave households and families, spending little effort to develop research questions that might flesh out the issues, or pausing to consider how households and families impacted the larger cultural questions that

¹ The term "enslaved African" refers to individuals whose ancestry originated on the African continent and were enslaved in the Western world. When the term "slave" is used in the text, this is not intended to suggest that a person's primary identity was as a slave. All individuals, slave or free, inhabited multiple identities depending upon the circumstances. During the course of a day, a female slave also could be a mother, wife, friend, sister, niece, godmother, cook, artisan, and so on, or a combination of these roles. Similarly, for brevity, the term "enslaved" intentionally was preceded by the descriptive word "African."

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

The glory of Afro-Americana inheres in the durable fiber of humanity, in the face of what surely must have been the most repressive epoch in modern world history. It depended—had to depend—on creativity and innovation far more than on the indelibility of particular cultural contents.

Sidney Mintz (1974:14)

Historical archaeologists studying enslaved Africans and their descendants only rarely have focused their attention on the types of households and families that enslaved peoples formed. The composition of households and the stability of families that enslaved Africans¹ were able to create has been debated among historians, sociologists, and anthropologists for more than 50 years, generating a sizeable literature on the subject (see Frazier 1930, 1939 [2001]; Stampp 1956; Myrdal 1964; Rainwater and Yancey 1967; Billingsley 1968; Du Bois 1908 [1969]; Staples 1971; 1973; Blassingame 1972; Hill 1972; Fogel and Engerman 1974; Furstenberg, Hershberg, and Modell 1975; Elkins 1976; Genovese 1976; Gutman 1976; Kulikoff 1977a, 1978; Norton et al. 1983; Sobel 1987; Malone 1992; Mintz and Price 1992; Robertson 1996; Stevenson 1996a; Walsh 1997; Morgan 1998:498-558; Patterson 1998). Yet for the most part, historical archaeologists have all but ignored the issue of slave households and families, spending little effort to develop research questions that might flesh out the issues, or pausing to consider how households and families impacted the larger cultural questions that

¹ The term "enslaved Africans" refers to individuals whose ancestry originated on the African continent and were enslaved in the Western world. When the term "slave" is used in the text, this is not intended to suggest that a person's primary identity was as a slave. All individuals, slave or free, inhabited multiple identities depending upon the circumstances. During the course of a day, a female slave also could be a mother, wife, friend, sister, nurse, gardener, cook, artisan, and so on, or a combination of these roles. Similarly, for brevity, the term "servant" sometimes is not preceded by the transitive verb "indentured."

routinely dominate the research. Yet, the tangible sites of slavery—those quarters, plantations, farmsteads, and even urban lots where enslaved Africans lived and worked—have been the focal point of excavations and are some of the most valuable sources of information concerning household and family.²

This dissertation will focus on the rate of growth, the condition, and the character of households and families at one slave quarter site, a place known as Utopia, located a few miles outside the town of Williamsburg, Virginia, overlooking the James River (Figures 1.1 and 1.2). Four successive generations of African and African-American slaves occupied the Utopia Quarter for roughly a century, between the 1670s and 1770s, leaving behind a vast array of archaeological evidence, including nearly 100,000 artifacts, a dozen structures, a small burial ground, and nearly 175 discrete features such as sub-floor pits, postholes, trash pits, ditches, fence lines, and a well. The primary research objective is to track the process of household change and family formation between the four occupations at Utopia as measured by archaeological data. The archaeological findings regarding the forms and functions of households and families will be interwoven with the documentary record pertaining to Utopia and compared to similar slave sites throughout the Chesapeake, shedding light on one of the more significant African-American cultural occurrences, the creation of family groups living in households.

² I have purposely avoided labeling the type of archaeology conducted at Utopia. While there are innumerable ways to refer to such archaeology, I believe that the study of the African-American past is a subfield encompassed under the umbrella of historical archaeology. By my definition historical archaeology is a process, not a reference to the object of our study. As such, historical archaeology is the study of literate societies that involves weaving together documentary, ethnographic, and archaeological lines of evidence to produce a comprehensive understanding of, in this case a site, that must be situated within a body of anthropological theory. This approach has been applied to Utopia.

Although historical archaeologists have been slow to embrace the matter, Utopia and quartering sites like it can serve as testing grounds to track the evolution of slave households and families. Indeed, the slave quarter³ served as the primary venue for the outgrowth of families in the Chesapeake. At thousands of quartering sites across the American South groups of enslaved Africans and their American-born descendants lived in households and banded together to form families. In this manner, enslaved men, women, and children constructed a way of life within the constraints of slavery that served as a buffer against their oppressors, in the process creating a remarkable cultural milieu founded on the traits of inventiveness, resiliency, resourcefulness, and novelty as a means to resist the brutality of slavery (see Mintz 1974:14). This cultural heritage based on creativity and innovation is an inextricable element of the African-American arts still today, embedded in blues and jazz, in modern dance, in literature, the visual arts, and film (see Locke 1940; Huggins 1971; Emery 1972; Ellison 1953 [1994]; Stuckey 1994; Morgan 1998:580-609).

While ingenuity and adaptability are trademarks of the African-American arts, some scholars have labeled the ethos that developed under slavery as a "culture of resistance" (see Mintz 1974, 1995; Palmié 1995). Unquestionably, resistance to this repressive system took on a wide range of forms, from the rare instances of organized armed revolt, to the more prosaic daily acts of individual defiance (see Bauer and Bauer 1942; Aptheker 1943; Rose 1982:31-32; Okihiro 1986; Wyatt-Brown 1988; Scott 1990;

³ To manage large tracts of land often planters divided plantations into parcels known as "quarters." Groups of slaves were assigned to live on these subdivided tracts. "Quarters" also refer to the individual houses for slaves, as in a place of lodging or quartering (see Morton 1956:75; Morgan 1998:105-106).

Paquette 1991; Mullin 1992; Mintz 1995). Sidney Mintz has developed a tentative typology of slave resistance, classifying it into four categories: *violent*, *nonviolent*, *unintentional*, and *cultural*, all of which would have resulted in some degree of disadvantage for the slave owner (1995:14-15). So, for example, when a field slave intentionally broke her hoe, this was an act of nonviolent resistance, whereas accidentally inadvertently breaking her tool could be considered unintentional resistance, and of course swinging her hoe at the overseer was violent resistance. As for the fourth type—cultural resistance—by using the hoe in a manner that affirmed her identity as someone other than a slave, our fieldworker was culturally resisting. Thus, she might use the hoe in her own garden, or she might place it on a makeshift shrine in the evenings as a gesture of faith to her gods.

Cultural resistance is difficult to define largely because of the intangibility of its effects. Whereas the other three forms of resistance all had measurable economic repercussions—the hoe was broken or used for violence—cultural resistance was a state of mind that defies quantification. As historian Michael Mullin describes it, cultural resistance “may be understood as a refusal to abandon one’s values and traditions” (1992:2). Historian Philip D. Morgan goes so far as to propose,

Wherever and whenever masters, whether implicitly or explicitly, recognized the independent will or volition of their slaves, they acknowledged the humanity of their bondpeople. Extracting this admission was, in fact, a form of slave resistance, because slaves thereby opposed the dehumanization inherent in their status. (1998:xxii)

By these definitions, the formation of families and households by slaves can be considered a powerful form of cultural resistance. But was the creation of households and families really an act of resistance in a strict sense of the term? After all, households

and families were hardly the exclusive domain of enslaved Africans and African Americans. To live among kin and friends was not to strike a blow against the repressive slave system, but more simply a means to establish some semblance of stability, support and personal satisfaction. This was a "culture of perseverance" more than a "culture of resistance."⁴ That the overwhelming majority of slaves succeeded in finding mates and bearing children while living within a system of violent subjugation is a remarkable testament to the perseverance of a people under severe and destructive conditions.

In its most barbaric form New World slavery was intended to strip individuals of survival skills so as to shape each slave into a compliant and productive worker. To achieve this state of being, countless slaves were physically and psychologically battered into submission to varying degrees until approaching a status of what has been described as "social death" (Patterson 1982:13). When the first documented Africans set foot in Virginia in 1619, the chances against forming lasting familial bonds while under the mantle of slavery were daunting, although some were able to beat the odds before race-based slavery became entrenched (see Deal 1993; Berlin 1998:29-46). In the latter decades of the 17th century and the early part of the 18th, an uneven sex ratio favoring men, cultural differences, language barriers, social isolation, and a lack of choice concerning coresidence temporarily hampered the formation of family groups. For those slaves who overcame these obstacles to find spouses and produce children, there was no guarantee that a cohesive unit would be able to remain together. No legal sanctions protected slave marriages, and husbands and wives could be separated at the whim of

⁴ Because the concept of resistance has evolved to have such broad meanings, some believe it has lost much of its analytical usefulness (M. Brown 1996; see also Mintz 1995:17).

their owner. Even more tormenting, slave parents had no control over the fate of their children. And yet, given the difficulties inhibiting family formation, slaves succeeded in forging a culturally distinctive institution that was adaptive enough to survive slavery and provide a measure of emotional comfort, pleasure, and fulfillment (see Kulikoff 1986; Berlin 1998; Morgan 1998).

Project Framework

Located on a bluff looking out over the James River, several miles down river from Jamestown Island in James City County, Virginia, the Utopia Quarter site was occupied almost continuously for 100 years (see Figures 1.1 and 1.2). When a mixture of servants and slaves began living at Utopia in the 1670s only a few thousand Africans resided in Virginia, making up less than ten percent of the local population (Morgan 1977:420-423). When the site was vacated around 1775, African Americans comprised almost half the population of Virginia, a more than four-fold increase (Kulikoff 1986:340). During the site's lifetime, slavery evolved from a minor source of labor into the cultural, social, and economic linchpin of Chesapeake society, and Africans and African Americans had gone from peripheral social figures to arguably the most important social group influencing cultural change in the region.

In that century between the 1670s and 1770s, a mixture of enslaved Africans and English indentured servants, and then three subsequent generations of enslaved Africans and their descendants lived out the dramas of daily life at the Utopia Quarter. The four groups of people occupied the quarter at roughly 20- to 30-year intervals (Table 1.1).

As an archaeological site, the Utopia Quarter is not much larger than two football fields, yet this circumscribed spot served as a cultural incubator. In the early years at

Table 1.1. Chronology of the four occupation periods at the Utopia Quarter.

Period	Time Span	Primary Owner	Occupants
1	ca. 1675 – 1700	Thomas Pettus II	Servants and Slaves
2	1700 – ca. 1730	James Bray II	Slaves
3	ca. 1730 – ca. 1750	Thomas Bray II and James Bray III	Slaves
4	ca. 1750 – ca. 1775	Lewis Burwell IV	Slaves

Utopia and at countless other sites throughout the Chesapeake⁵, small groups of mostly enslaved Africans from diverse backgrounds, created a new social world. Thrust into a slave system that curtailed cultural development, the earliest generations of slaves at Utopia nonetheless gradually built new cultural institutions. Subsequent generations continued to modify the fragile cultural modes until a distinctive African-American culture took root. What began at places such as Utopia as a mélange of fractured African cultures became something new that was both African and American in form, and shaped by the experience of enslavement.

The form of culture that emerged at Utopia was a result of creolization. Cultural creolization has been described as “the interaction between two or more cultures to produce an integrated mix which is different from its antecedents” (Deetz 1996:213; see also Berlin 1980:45n3; Joyner 1989:147; Franklin 1997:8-10; Dawdy 2000). Indeed, the residents of Utopia combined elements of their African cultures with European-American ones (and perhaps traces of Native American cultures) to generate something new, a hybrid that contained components of each. The result of a century of cultural growth at

⁵ In the 17th and 18th centuries, the Chesapeake region as referenced herein spanned from the Chesapeake Bay to the fall line of the major rivers between the headwaters of the Susquehanna River on the north and the North Carolina border on the south, but extending to the west to the Blue Ridge Mountains in Virginia and included the Eastern Shore of Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware (Kulikoff 1986:18; Kelso 1995:75).

Utopia was the creation of a distinctive African-American culture, one that resembled parts of its various parent cultures, but also was unique as well.

Family was only one of the many cultural institutions in transition at Utopia. The wider social, cultural, economic, political, and religious factors shaping life there underwent dramatic change in the century between the 1670s and 1770s. It is probably not an exaggeration to suggest that the residents that eventually abandoned the site in the 1770s would hardly have known what to make of their predecessors 100 years earlier, and vice versa. Outwardly at least, a century of cultural change would have made these groups strangers to one another. Among other things, they spoke different languages, dressed differently, had altered work routines and skills, differing access to goods, interacted in vastly changed demographic circumstances, and had developed widely varying religious beliefs. In short, the configuration of cultural mores at Utopia, those "socially transmitted rules for behavior, the ways of thinking about and doing things" (Deetz 1996:35), had changed dramatically over a century.

And yet, for all the apparent cultural distance separating the first and last residents of Utopia, cultural continuities existed. Households remained a consistent organizing principal throughout the life of the site. They functioned as cooperative units intended to benefit all its members, whether or not those members were related by blood or marriage, and they served as the foundations for the development of families. Although the conception of "family" and "household" metamorphosed and the rules governing family and household membership changed over time, it was these two institutions that formed the basis of African-American culture at places like Utopia (Frazier 1930, 1939 [2001];

Gutman 1975, 1976; Kulikoff 1977a, 1978, 1986; Sudarkasa 1980, 1988; Norton et al. 1988; Berlin 1998; Morgan 1998).

The Utopia Quarter site is an ideal setting for the study of slave household formation. To date no archaeologists have tested models of cultural change at a Chesapeake slave quarter site, in part because in most cases the nature of the data has not allowed for this kind of analysis. Most excavated sites span only one generation at most. Utopia offers a rare opportunity to examine the *longue durée*; in this case, four sequential occupation episodes that span the 1670s to 1770s, allowing for the comparison of the archaeological findings from each of the four periods. Moreover, activity at Utopia coincided with the period of time when slaves throughout the Chesapeake region gradually assembled into family units organized within households. The beginnings of slave family formation commenced when the first residents were living at Utopia in the latter decades of the 17th century. In these early years only a small number of Chesapeake slaves were able to live in family groups or formal households, residing instead in random, disorganized groupings not of their own choosing that can be classified as coresident living units. By the time activity came to a close at Utopia in the 1770s, the processes of slave family formation had matured to the point that a majority of Chesapeake slaves lived, by choice, among kith and kin, in many cases under the same roof. This transformation from widespread cultural alienation, isolation, and disunity to deeply rooted family alliances is one of the most dramatic accomplishments of African-American slaves, and it is a process that I argue is visible within the archaeological record at places such as Utopia.

In this study my interest in Utopia's households and the African-American families⁶ living inside them is centered on two primary issues: the rate of household and family formation, and the physical form that the evolving households achieved. Three types of archaeological data will be used to test and examine family and household formation processes at Utopia, and in particular to explore the rate of development and physical form these social groupings attained. First, architectural change will be investigated. It is hypothesized that in the earliest phases at Utopia unrelated groups of slaves coresided in dwellings that functioned as barracks. As time passed, family units materialized during later phases at Utopia, and these smaller family units, sometimes nuclear in form, required less space. Therefore, I theorize that the size of housing units will decrease over time, indicating a shift in residency patterns as slaves formed more intimate attachments and lived in increasingly smaller housing units that were more readily able to accommodate close kin (Figure 1.3). These phenomena will be analyzed at Utopia, and compared statistically with a sample of known slave quarters recorded throughout the Chesapeake region.

Research has shown that Chesapeake slaves developed an adaptive solution to the lack of storage space in overcrowded quarters by digging storage pits into the floors of their dwellings. Sometimes known by the more vernacular term "root cellars," hundreds of these sub-floor pits, ranging from small cubby holes to large pits that functioned like

⁶ Because not all African Americans were enslaved, the term "African-American family" is more inclusive than the term "slave family." However, the focus of this study is on the development of families and households at the Utopia Quarter site, a specific place populated almost exclusively by enslaved people of African descent. Enslavement played a defining role in the process of family formation at Utopia to the extent that the residents indeed formed "slave families." Thus, when referencing this wider context, the term "African-American family" will be used, whereas "slave family" will be used in reference to Utopia.

small basements, have been studied by archaeologists at slave quarter sites throughout the Chesapeake region and elsewhere (see e.g., Kelso 1984; Kimmel 1993; Neiman 1997; Samford 2000; Galle 2004). Fraser Neiman has proposed that the number of sub-floor pits in slave housing units decreased over time in response to the growth of family groups (1997). He further hypothesizes that in the earlier years coresident groups comprised of unrelated individuals generated more sub-floor pits than later households consisting of kin-related members (see Figure 1.3). The idea behind this is that strangers or potential competitors vying for meager resources in a crowded living environment were more likely to procure private storage spaces for themselves whereas intimately related members were more inclined to cooperate and to share storage space (Neiman 1997). I explore Neiman's theory regarding sub-floor pit change at Utopia, and subsequently compare Utopia with a sample of slave quarter sites within the Chesapeake.

As a final means to assess the formation of family and household at Utopia, I analyze selected assemblages of artifacts from the site. I attempt to isolate artifact groups that differed significantly between coresident groups and households based on the premise that coresident groups were not as capable of generating the quantity and quality of some resources as households. A household made up of closely allied family members, sharing responsibilities, dividing labor, and contributing the welfare of the group was a more efficient unit of consumption and better able to acquire some types of goods than a loosely knit pack of strangers. Based on this theory I single out artifact types that were likely to be more abundant in households, and proceed to identify instances of significant differences between Utopia's housing units. A secondary supposition examines gender as a benchmark of housing unit membership. I expect to

find a relatively balanced ratio of women to men in a stable household, whereas coresidential groups were more likely to consist of a single-sex inhabitant group. To reach some conclusions on this I select sets of artifacts most likely to be associated with women's or men's activity and compare ratios of these artifacts within eight of the Utopia housing units. By interpreting the resource consumption and gender patterns together, the membership of Utopia's housing units begins to come into focus.

Presented alone, changes in the sizes of the housing units, or the quantities of sub-floor pits, or the character of the artifact assemblages might not provide a convincing case for the significant transformations that were taking place among households and families at the Utopia Quarter. For example, a reduction in the size of housing units over time is expected to indicate the gradual development of smaller, interrelated family units, but other factors could have contributed to this change (see Figure 1.3). A lack of building materials, economic forces, or gradual alterations to the vernacular building tradition could have contributed to this change as well. Moreover, while the number of sub-floor pits inside the housing units at Utopia is expected to decrease as family members were more prone to share storage space than unrelated individuals (see Figure 1.3), this decline could be attributed to the introduction of a new culture group to the area, or possibly the enforcement of new management practices that either limited the number of pits or provided slaves with alternative storage facilities. In terms of the artifact assemblages, the persistent growth of a consumer culture throughout the 18th century occurred in tandem with household growth, and clarifying which had a greater impact on the archaeological record is a difficult task. To make matters worse, differences in the volume of features that comprise each housing unit make an across the

board comparison of assemblages problematical. Nonetheless, collectively I believe all three sources of evidence will reveal genuine differences between housing units at Utopia; differences that represent a transformation from coresidence to household, and the growth of slave families at Utopia.

Project Setting

The Utopia Quarter site is a spectacular piece of riverfront property. Perched some 80 feet above the shore on the north side of the James River, and tucked into the crescent of a dramatic bend in the course of the waterway, Hog Island is visible directly across the way as it juts out into the channel. Due to the curve in the river, the line of sight from Utopia extends 13 miles downriver and more than seven miles upriver (see Figure 1.1). Downriver one can see Mulberry Island, beyond that Burwell Bay, and beyond that the confluence of several major rivers at Hampton Roads. Turning up river, the eastern tip of Jamestown Island is unmistakable. Aside from the dome of a nuclear power plant on Hog Island and a small fleet of decommissioned naval ships stored in the channel across from Mulberry Island, the view with the naked eye has changed little over the past 300 years (see Figure 1.2).

Today the Utopia Quarter site and its surrounding land is owned by Anheuser Busch, Inc., and managed by a subsidiary corporation, Busch Properties, Inc. Busch acquired the 3,600-acre Kingsmill property in 1971 from the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Shortly thereafter Busch also purchased an attached 160-acre tract owned and operated as Camp Wallace by the U. S. Army since 1919. After building a brewery which began operation in 1972, and concurrently breaking ground for a Busch Gardens theme park, Busch Properties began to develop the majority of their property into a

sprawling up-scale community known as Kingsmill on the James (Figure 1.4). Several thousand residents now live at Kingsmill, which also operates three golf courses, a resort, various restaurants, and a conference facility, in addition to the brewery and theme park.

Measuring roughly three miles of river frontage between College Creek on the west and Grove Creek on the east, today's Kingsmill proper is bound on the north by Route 199 and Route 60 (Figure 1.5). The Kingsmill name originated with Richard Kingsmill who patented 500 acres of land in the western section of the property in the 1620s. Throughout the 17th century local residents used a variety of names for the area between College Creek and Grove Creek (Figure 1.6). At times the entire area was known as Archer's Hope or Mounts Bay (Fesler 2000:15-18). Subsections of the property included Farley's Neck, Harrop, Littletown, Kingsmill Neck, Tuttey's Neck, Hampton Key, and Utopia (see Figure 1.6). It was only when the property was consolidated by Busch Properties in 1971 that a single name, Kingsmill, was consigned to the entire tract. The names of some landmarks also have changed since the early days. For example, Archer's Hope Creek is now College Creek and the original Wareham's Pond is now Grove Creek (see Figures 1.5 and 1.6).

Physical and Environmental Setting

The Utopia Quarter site is located on a high broad scarp at approximately 73' to 82' above mean sea level. Grove Creek, Warehams Pond and their tributaries form a series of deep ravines that dissect the general landform surrounding the Utopia site, creating a relatively isolated neck of land (see Figure 1.6). The ravines were dramatic enough that surveyors in the early 17th century referred to the area as "the Ponds" (Nugent 1979:168).

The southernmost boundary of the site extends up to the edge of a high bluff overlooking the James River (see Figure 1.2). A small, inactive ravine forms the east edge of the site. The ravine extended inland from the James River shoreline for a distance of approximately 600 feet and likely afforded access to the James River beach for the 17th- and 18th-century residents of Utopia. Later in the 20th century, the Army used the ravine as a roadbed that provided a route to the beach. The modern road may have masked an earlier historic-era roadbed. The site is large enough that its north end is oriented to a tributary branch of Warehams Pond rather than the James River. Located on a knoll above Warehams Pond to the north and west, the south and east edges of this end of the site spread inland with no significant topographic interruption (see Figure 1.2).

The entire area encompassing the site experienced repeated plowing in the past. All areas of the site consisted of three primary soil matrices. First, topsoil layers of leaf mat, roots, and dark brown sandy loam were encountered consistently throughout the area at depths of 0.1' to 0.5'. Below the accumulated forest duff, a plowzone layer of medium brown sandy loam was present across the entire area. The plowzone varied in depth from 0.5' to 1.9'. Subsoil generally consisted of yellow and orange sandy clay throughout the property.

The majority of the Utopia Quarter site and the surrounding landform consists of Kempsville-Emporia fine sandy loams (Hodges et al. 1985). The Kempsville-Emporia matrix is well suited for cultivation and rated as prime farmland (ibid.:29, 43), and likely served as one of the main incentives for 17th- and 18th-century settlement (see Lukezic 1990).

For most of the 20th century the entire Utopia property remained forested. In the latter 19th and early 20th centuries loggers apparently harvested some areas of the property. Prior to that, planters and farmers placed large portions of the Utopia tract under cycles of cultivation in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries.

To clear the land for hoe agriculture, planters and farmers often girdled the trees and left them to die over a period of years (Carr et al. 1991:34-35). Typically, after several successive seasons of cultivation, the land would be left to stand fallow and regenerate for upwards of 20 years. In the general area, like elsewhere in the tidewater zones of Virginia, stands of pine trees, primarily loblolly, shortleaf, and Virginia pine, dominated the landscape (Gottman 1955:244). The understory of re-growth also includes hardwoods, usually black gum, sweet gum yellow poplar, red oak, and white oak (ibid.:244-245). In addition to the predominant species of trees, the forest understory in and around the site is comprised of a variety of shrubs, herbaceous plants, grasses and sedges. On the margins of the property, in the wetland areas along Warehams Pond and Grove Creek, a slightly different plant and tree environment prevails (see Hodges et al. 1985:47-50).

Both the soils and plant environment modify and arbitrate the range and types of wildlife in the area. During the 17th and 18th centuries, the cycles of deforestation and re-growth served as a habitat for many species of wildlife including deer, fox, rabbit, squirrel, opossum, skunk, woodchuck, and raccoon. In the marshes muskrat, mink, beaver, and otter thrived. Turkey, quail, pigeon, and dove could be found in the uplands, while waterfowl such as duck and geese frequent the marshes, creeks and rivers, as well as birds of prey. Fish such as catfish, rockfish, bass, shad, sunfish, carp, bluegill, gar, and

sturgeon were available to the inhabitants of Utopia in both nearby freshwater and estuarine zones. Shellfish such as oyster and clam were available in the tidal zones of the rivers and creeks, and varieties of crab and crayfish could be obtained in the estuarine marshes of Grove Creek (see Gottman 1955:286-298; Hodges et al. 1985:49). The 17th- and 18th-century environment in and around Utopia, due to its location near rich freshwater and estuarine zones, likely provided its residents an abundant habitat to exploit.

Previous Archaeology

Due in part to a clause in the purchase agreement with Colonial Williamsburg that stipulated preservation of historic sites, Busch Properties, Inc. has maintained a long-standing commitment to conduct archaeological investigations on its property. In 1972 Dr. William M. Kelso was the first to encourage Busch to pursue archaeological projects in advance of development. As commissioner of the Virginia Research Center for Archaeology at the time, Kelso directed excavations at approximately a dozen 17th- and 18th-century archaeological sites at Kingsmill between 1972 and 1976, including a season of excavation at the Utopia Quarter in 1973 (Figure 1.7). Kelso's work culminated in the publication of *Kingsmill Plantations 1619-1800: Archaeology of Country Life in Colonial Virginia* (1984).

None of the acreage at Kingsmill was formally surveyed archaeologically. At the time—the early 1970s—there were no state or federal rules or guidelines dictating archaeological surveys. Instead, Kelso's crew identified the locations of approximately 15 historic sites on an informal basis (see Figure 1.7), including a scatter of artifacts at the Utopia Quarter site. That artifact scatter at Utopia was first encountered in February

1972 and subsequently registered at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources as site 44JC32 (Kelso 1973:iv).

The origin of the name Utopia almost certainly is derived from one of the earliest patentees of the property, John Utie (also Utey and Uty) who held the land for a short time in the late 1620s (Goodwin 1958; Kelso 1984:35). By the time he sold the property in 1629 Utie apparently christened it with the name "Utopia," a clever combination of his name and Thomas More's concept of a perfect society. The name Utopia first appeared in print in a 1646 land grant when William Browning formally patented the property (Nugent 1979:168). Some, but not all, of the later 17th- and 18th-century owners of the Utopia tract referred to it by that name. In any case, in 1973 when Kelso initiated archaeological excavations at site 44JC32 located on the Utopia tract, he consigned the name to the site to maintain a sense of historical continuity.

Beginning in November 1973, Kelso devoted one field season of archaeology to Utopia (44JC32). The excavation ended in May 1974 after a ten-week hiatus in December, January, and February. During the course of the dig, Kelso's crew uncovered a 38' by 18' post-in-ground dwelling outfitted with a brick-lined half-basement, a well, a fence line and paralleling drainage ditch that partially enclosed the yard, a small outbuilding, a stock watering pit, and a single human burial identified as an older African-American woman (Kelso 1976; 1984:72-76) (Figure 1.8). Based on the artifact findings Kelso surmised that the site was occupied from ca. 1670 to 1710. Thomas Pettus II owned the property during much of this period and maintained an unknown number of both English indentured servants and enslaved Africans working for him (Kelso 1984). Subsequent studies of the ceramics and faunal remains suggested the

primary inhabitants of the site were indentured servants in Pettus' employ, or possibly tenants renting the land from him (Outlaw et al. 1977; Miller 1978).

As work proceeded at Utopia Kelso dispatched members of his crew to conduct limited testing outside the core area of 44JC32. Some 400' to the north of 44JC32 an 18th-century storage cellar was identified and sampled (Hazard 1972; Kelso 1984:108). Because of this finding, the area to the north of Utopia proper was designated as site 44JC68, and christened with the name "Jacko's Quarter" based on historic documentation (Kelso 1984:108). However, no further testing was conducted at that time, in part because the location was under no threat of development. Next to 44JC68 archaeologists also recorded the collapsed remains of a 20' by 40' house dating to the late 19th century, as well as several features related to it, and the inventory number 44JC69 was assigned to it (Hazard 1972).

At the completion of the excavation of Utopia in 1974, Kelso covered the excavated half-basement with corrugated tin in an effort to preserve it while it remained open. The other excavation areas were covered with plastic and within a year or two became overgrown with brush. After an interlude of close to 20 years, Busch renewed its commitment to preserving and studying the historic heritage of its property in 1993 when plans were formulated to develop a 270-acre forested subsection of the property that included the Utopia Quarter site. The 270 acres corresponded with the area that had been known since the 17th century as Utopia (see Figure 1.6). More recently, between 1919 and 1971 more than half of the 270 acres had been part of Camp Wallace (see Figure 1.5). I served as principal investigator of the formal Phase I archaeological survey of the 270 acres, a project that was completed in the early spring of 1993.

Before the 1993 survey five sites had been identified previously on the 270-acre tract, including the location of the Utopia site (44JC32), and the sites at 44JC68 and 44JC69 (see Figure 1.7). The results of the Phase I survey produced 29 additional sites, including thirteen related to historic activity (Fesler 1997c). As for Utopia, the Phase I findings expanded the site boundaries of the site as understood in the 1970s (Figure 1.9). In fact, the deposits of artifacts at Utopia overlapped, yet were so widely scattered, that I assigned five separate site numbers to different areas of the site (see Figure 1.9). Only later, after more intensive excavation, were sites 44JC68 and 44JC69 consolidated into 44JC32. For the purposes of record keeping, the northernmost portions of the site at 44JC787 and 44JC788 retained their original numbers. Overall, the entire site consisting of 44JC32 (44JC68 and 44JC69), 44JC787, and 44JC788 was approximately a dozen acres in size.

I initiated renewed excavation at these Utopia sites in June 1993, with the most intensive period of excavation occurring between March and September 1995. By September 1997 the excavation was completed. Once the full extent of the site was exposed, it became apparent that the Utopia Quarter consisted of four discrete occupation periods, spanning from the 1670s to the 1770s, and a small burial ground (Figure 1.10). Activity during Period 1 (ca. 1675 – 1700) and Period 2 (1700 – ca. 1730) took place within the boundaries of what originally was 44JC32 (cf. Figures 1.9 and 1.10). Activity associated with Period 3 (ca. 1730 – ca. 1750) occurred within the zones designated as 44JC68 and 44JC69 (cf. Figures 1.9 and 1.10). The burial ground was in use primarily during the Period 3 occupation. Habitation during Period 4 (ca. 1750 – ca. 1775) corresponds with the site at 44JC787, and to a lesser extent with 44JC788.

Organization of Dissertation

The remainder of this dissertation is organized into eight chapters. Following the introductory chapter, the anthropological concepts of household and family, the development of household archaeology, and the past and current thinking regarding the history of the African-American family are outlined in Chapter 2. The terms *family*, *household*, *co-resident group*, and *housing unit* are defined and reviewed. The principles of household archaeology were used to excavate Utopia, and its emergence as a sub-field of archaeology is described. Finally, in Chapter 2 the continuing debate concerning the condition of the African-American family and its linkage with slavery is discussed.

Chapter 3 provides a background of the cultural, historical, and demographic factors that influenced family and household development at places such as Utopia. As a means of providing an anthropological context for the study, I introduce creolization theory as I apply it to culture change at Utopia. Next, I evaluate West and Central African conceptions of kinship and gender roles. The stages of slave family and community development have been sorted into chronological phases by Chesapeake historians. These phases are reviewed and compared to the four occupation periods at Utopia. In this same section I evaluate a set of case studies drawn together by historians examining the composition of 18th-century Chesapeake slave residency units.

Chapter 4 is a general history of the Utopia Quarter and the four occupation episodes. Included in the historical background is a brief profile of each of the five principal owners of Utopia, and a full accounting of the fragmentary documentary information pertaining to the slaves who lived at the site. Furthermore, the history of the Utopia Quarter is integrated into the larger historical trajectory of the Chesapeake,

illustrating at those junctures where the site's history parallels the region, and where the site and the region diverge.

Chapter 5 provides a detailed review of the archaeological findings from Utopia. The four discrete occupation periods and a burial ground are discussed separately as individual sites. A series of analytical tests are applied to the different occupation periods to help pinpoint when each was in use and for how long. In a final section, the archaeological data are interwoven with the historical documentation from the previous chapter to provide a comprehensive timeline for Utopia.

In Chapter 6 I examine the various forms and functions of slave quarters at Utopia and the larger Chesapeake. Initially I review the changing vernacular tradition of slave quarter architecture, before launching into a detailed examination of nine housing units at Utopia. A dataset of 73 Chesapeake slave housing units then is analyzed, guided by the premise that the decreasing size of slave housing units corresponded with the growth of households and family units. In a final section of the chapter I reassess changes in slave quarter architecture and the corresponding relationship to slave households and families at Utopia and the greater Chesapeake.

Chapter 7 focuses on the connection between sub-floor pits and changing slave residency patterns. First, the current thinking on Chesapeake sub-floor pits, their forms and functions, is detailed. The 64 sub-floor pits excavated at Utopia are evaluated, followed by an analysis of 269 pits recorded at 73 slave quarters located throughout the Chesapeake region. It is hypothesized that the average number of pits diminished over time in conjunction with emergence of slave households and families. A final section of

the chapter summarizes the findings and outlines the apparent relationship between sub-floor pits and the changing Chesapeake slave family.

In Chapter 8 I focus on Utopia's artifact assemblages and select a set of artifact types for analysis that I hypothesize will be more abundant in households than coresident groups. This assemblage of resource consumption goods—things such as tools, firearms, fishing tackle, eating utensils, and kitchen equipment—I believe would be more likely to be acquired by a organized, efficient household than a group of people coresiding together, and I test this premise by comparing the housing units at Utopia. Next, I investigate the gender makeup of the site's housing units by comparing the ratios of selected artifacts that would have been used primarily by women or men. Those housing units with high ratios of presumed women's or men's artifacts may have functioned as single-sex coresidences, whereas a household is expected to have a better balance of women and men. A concluding section of the chapter reviews the resource consumption and gender findings for the eight of the housing units.

In Chapter 9 I pull together the findings from the various analytical chapters to present a cumulative depiction of Utopia's residency patterns and place these findings into a historical context. To accomplish this I interpret each housing unit at Utopia, combining the findings generated by the historical, architectural, sub-floor pit, and artifact analysis. This allows me to reconstruct the sequence of events that led to the growth and formation of households and families at Utopia, concluding that the opportunity to live with loved ones improved with time at Utopia. I also discuss the larger implications of the findings at Utopia. The theories and methods used to study households and families at Utopia have potential applications at archaeological sites

outside African-American quartering sites in the Chesapeake, and perhaps within entirely different cultural settings. I suggest avenues of further research that can build upon the work at Utopia.

Figure 1.1. Location of the Utopia Quarter in the state of Virginia and on the Virginia peninsula.

Figure 1.1. Location of the Utopia Quarter in the state of Virginia and on the Virginia peninsula.

Figure 1.2. Location of Utopia Quarter, Pettus, Bray, and Burwell plantations on the U.S.G.S. quadrangle map (Hog Island 1984).

Figure 1.4. Overview map of development at Kingsmill on the James as of 1995.

Figure 1.3. Illustration of changes in architecture, sub-floor pits, and artifacts over time at Utopia.

Figure 1.4. Overview map of development at Kingsmill on the James as of 1995.

Figure 1.5. Topography, major drainages, and modern highways in relation to the Kingsmill area.

Figure 1.6. Place names in the vicinity of Kingsmill, Virginia, in the 17th century.

Figure 1.7. Location of historic sites at Kingsmill on the James property

Figure 1.8. Map of the Utopia Quarter site based upon findings in 1973-74 (Kelso 1984:73).

Figure 1.9. The Utopia Quarter site as designated as five interrelated sites.

Figure 1.10. Location of core occupation areas at the Utopia Quarter site.

CHAPTER II.

THE MAKING OF THE SLAVE FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD

The key social network that tied together involuntary immigrants, natives and newcomers, native and black Americans, and free and enslaved blacks was the family.

Philip D. Morgan (1998:497)

No firsthand descriptions of life at the Utopia Quarter exist. None of the site's owners were known to keep diaries or wrote narratives about their plantations, no travelers passed through the site and paused to describe or sketch the goings-on, and not a single scrap of paper has been left behind by the enslaved residents of Utopia. Aside from a small number of probates, inventories, wills, and lists from which people and activities at the site can be inferred, and a variety of frustratingly sparse secondary sources, the vast majority of the Utopia story must be teased from the artifacts and features that form the site's archaeological record.

To make a viable case about household and family formation at the Utopia Quarter, the research must be situated within the existing anthropological, archaeological, and historical thinking on the subject. By its nature, the process of historical archaeology is interdisciplinary and the methods and theories used to study Utopia are nested within several interrelated schools of thought and bodies of literature.

This chapter is divided into three interlinked sections that review the anthropological concepts of household and family, the development of household archaeology, and the past and current thinking regarding the history of the African-American family. First, the contemporary anthropological perspectives pertaining to family and household are reviewed, and several significant concepts including *family*, *household*, *coresident group*, and *housing unit* are dissected as a way to more precisely

identify how they functioned at Utopia. Household archaeology developed as a sub-field of archaeology in the 1960s and in a second section I discuss its relevance at sites like Utopia. The history and present condition of the African-American family continue to be a matter of debate and discussion. In a third section I examine the ongoing dialogue concerning the health and welfare of the African-American family and its links with slavery, including the types, forms, and functions of slave families. In a final short section, I situate the families and households at Utopia within the anthropological, archaeological, and historical context that comprises this chapter.

Families and Households

Anthropologists have long debated whether the family is universal and what motivated groups of people to form them. Most would agree that "procreation and the intense emotional bonds that grow out of it generate an invariant core to the family" in the vast majority of cultures (Yanagisako 1979:199). Historian Stanley Engerman captures the more ineffable character of the family by describing it as "a group of individuals of varying ages . . . with a bond of 'love' and 'altruism' not generally thought to be found in other groups in our society" (1978:275). While these descriptions might explain the psychological benefits of the family, others have sought more functional explanations for family development based on economic imperatives, kinship rules, or demographic patterns (Goody 1962, 1973, 1976; Netting et al. 1984:xx).

As an area of research, social scientists have only begun to intensively study the forms and functions of families since the 1960s. Until that time, most anthropologists limited their treatment of the family to categorizing it as a unit of kinship (Murdock 1949; Radcliffe-Brown and Forde 1950; Goody 1971). Even the early pioneers of

anthropology seemed relatively uninterested in the family beyond typology (see Morgan 1870, 1877 [1995]; Malinowski 1913 [1963]). Historians paid even less attention to the topic, most focusing their attention ostensibly on more important issues such as politics, wars, and industrialization. By the 1960s, however, a series of powerful social movements emerged that impacted all facets of American society, including the sorts of questions being asked in the social sciences. New sub-fields of study emerged that focused on specific ethnic groups, the underclasses, and women, and as an outgrowth of these the field of family history or family studies was born (Hareven 1991:95).

Social scientists quickly embraced the family as the primary building block of a society, and as "a culture in microcosm" (Deetz 1982:718). One of the leading authorities of family history, Peter Laslett, described the family as "the citadel of [society's] values, collective and individual" (1972:16), further suggesting, "The effect of family structure on attitudes, on sentiment, responses, on the set of the personality, is the major reason why it has attracted so much attention from the social scientists" (ibid.:10). Within a matter of a decade, the subject of family was removed from the margins of social science and placed squarely at center stage. Historians were able to reconstruct the structure of the past family, sometimes in great detail, by combing through demographic data such as parish registers, birth and death records, probates, wills, and tax lists. From this, models of family formation patterns could be developed for various cultures.

As interest in the family increased, it soon became apparent that the terminology used to describe the family and its relationships was insufficient for the growing

¹ Robin Fox has estimated that at least half the anthropological literature concerned with kinship primarily involves defining terminology (1967:340).

² Also known as the nuclear family, elementary family, conjugal family, or biological family.

complexity of the issue.¹ For example, still today the concepts of family and household continue to be conflated to the point that they seem to represent the same thing (Hammel and Laslett 1974:76-77; Moore 1988:54). To unravel the two concepts, most scholars have come to agree that kinship is the essential feature that defines a family, whereas propinquity or common residence defines a household (Bender 1967:493; Yanagisako 1979:162; see also Netting et al. 1984:xx; Wilk and Netting 1984:1-3). Thus, a family is a group of interrelated people, some of whom may live in a household occupying a particular physical space. Based on this definition, it is immediately clear that not all family members necessarily live in the same household, but they can be separated by long distances and remain members of the family. Additionally, not all households contain family members to the exclusion of others.

Family membership can vary in size from two people to two thousand people or more depending upon the cultural context and the kinship rules (Goody 1972:103). For instance, in some African cultures family membership may include all consanguineal relatives both living and dead. The types and varieties of families formed by kinship spans from the simple family² consisting at its most basic form as a parent and child, to complicated extended families (see Billingsley 1968:15-33 for African-American examples). Extended families can take on many different forms due to the specific sets of rules that govern how an individual traces descent. For example, some of the rules of descent concern residence, requiring a husband and wife to live with one or the other's family or perhaps to form a new residential group altogether (see Fox 1967).

¹ Robin Fox has estimated that at least half the anthropological literature concerned with kinship primarily involves defining terminology (1967:240).

² Also known as the nuclear family, elementary family, conjugal family, or biological family.

Archaeologists have developed analytical tools to interpret the functions, size, complexity, gender makeup, and other dimensions of households, and thereby it is possible to characterize the personnel that inhabit them. Theoretically then, the form and function of a family unit can be inferred from the archaeological remains of a household. For archaeological purposes, the household can be defined in any number of ways, from broad to specific. One of the earliest archaeological descriptions of the household made a distinction between a household cluster consisting of archaeological remains, and a household proper consisting of a group of people who interact and perform certain activities (Winter 1976:25). Later this definition was expanded to include three components: a social element made up of the members and their relationships; a material element composed of the dwelling, activity areas, and possessions; and a behavioral element comprised of the activities the household performs (Wilk and Rathje 1982:618).

One of the more useful typologies of African-American households based on social relationships and kinship was outlined by historian Ann Malone for use in her study of slave families and households in 19th-century Louisiana (1992:7-8):

- a) Simple family household—married couples with children (known also as a standard simple family); or married couple without children; or a single parent with offspring.
- b) Solitaire household—single, widowed, or person of unknown marital status.
- c) Non-nuclear family household—coresident siblings without spouses or children present; or coresident relatives without spouses or children; or unrelated coresidents who perceive themselves as a unit.
- d) Extended family household—a simple family household with one or more additional relatives.
- e) Multiple family household—two or more conjugal units (i.e., simple families, non-nuclear families, or extended families).

Malone's definitions of the primary types of household family groupings are directly applicable to the study of the Utopia Quarter, at least in its latter years.³ During the earlier phases of occupation, social relationships and kinship may not have dictated the living arrangements. For instance, unrelated individuals may have resided under the same roof in a barracks-type setting (in effect, a group of solitaires housed together). Malone's typology defines households purely based on social relationships, and from that standpoint it can be applied to those households at Utopia that were arranged by social connections. Social ties evidently did not dictate the membership of all households at Utopia, as in the case of barracks. Therefore, in conjunction with Malone's kin-related household typology, a second typology of household membership is needed; one based on behavior rather than social relationships (see Wilk and Rathje 1982:618). It is possible for archaeologists to identify particular activities (behaviors) that took place within a household, but the social relationships are not as readily visible in the archaeological record.

In 1988 Wendy Ashmore and Richard Wilk published one of the more comprehensive archaeological definitions of the household, distinguishing between it, a coresident group and a dwelling. According to Ashmore and Wilk (1988:6):

- a) A household is a social unit comprised of a group of people that participate together in at least one or more activities such as production, consumption, pooling of resources, reproduction, coresidence, and shared ownership.⁴

³ See also Morgan (1998:499) and Kulikoff (1977a:172) for historians' strategies to apply kinship terminology to slave families and households. Morgan suggests, for instance, that a more applicable term for a slave *simple family* or a married couple is a neutral expression such as *coresidential union* (1998:499).

⁴ In the early 1970s Laslett used less technical terms to define what went on in a household as "eating, sleeping, taking rest and leisure, growing up, child-rearing and procreating" (1972:24).

- b) A coresidential group is a "group of people who regularly share living quarters," but it "need not be equivalent to a household, in that people often live in the same building without sharing in the activities that normally define a household."
- c) A dwelling is "the physical structure or area within which residential activities took place."

A fourth term "housing unit" is included here as well to account for a functional dimension of some dwellings.

- d) A "housing unit" is equivalent to a "dwelling," both are physical structures. However, some dwellings may contain more than one housing unit. For example, a duplex is one contiguous physical structure (a dwelling), with two independent housing units back-to-back that happen to share the same roof.⁵

Under these terms, the key factor that defines a household is cooperation among its members in the various domestic tasks.⁶ Researchers seem to agree that households are not confined to a single housing unit because as long as its members are allied in performing domestic tasks, they can be dispersed among many housing units (see Bender 1967:495).⁷ However, members of a coresident group must inhabit the same housing unit; they must coreside. Furthermore, two or more households can inhabit a single housing unit, or more than one family can belong to a single household.⁸ Although the differences between household, coresidential group, dwelling, and housing unit may

⁵ The term "housing unit" will be used throughout this dissertation as a functionally neutral reference to slave living quarters, and the term "residency group" will be used to describe an undefined group of people living in a housing unit.

⁶ Ashmore and Wilk purposely avoid the term *domestic* so as to sidestep some of the recent debate over its real and implied meaning; although there is vague agreement that at its core there are two sets of domestic functional activities, "those pertaining to food production and consumption and those pertaining to social reproduction, including child-bearing and child-rearing" (Yanagisako 1979:166).

⁷ An individual may belong to several households.

⁸ Laslett defines two or more households under the same roof as a houseful (1972:36). This is an important discrepancy when considering cultures that live in compounds of dwellings. Jack Goody suggests, "While large compounds form a household in the residential sense, they break up into smaller units for the major socio-economic tasks of reproduction, production, and consumption" (1972:116). Goody's observation is a reminder that, for analytical purposes, a household is defined by its functions, not by its membership.

seem trivial, differentiating between them is crucial for archaeologists because it cannot be assumed that excavation of a dwelling or a housing unit is equivalent to excavating a household. Under these terms, the only certainty is that a housing unit contains a coresidential group, a group that potentially may divide into several households. Thus, Ashmore and Wilk caution that it is only after "protracted study" that the household as an analytic unit can be defined from archaeological data (1988:6). Or sometimes the archaeological determination of a household unit may elude our grasp altogether.

Rather than getting bogged down in definitions of the household, Olga Linares suggests that since they are "characterized by flexibility, indeterminacy, and multiple functions," we might simply say, "households are what households do" (1984:407). Linares illustrates that, for archaeological purposes, households are defined largely not by who lives in them, but by what its members do in alliance with one another. Household personnel must cooperate to carry out a set of domestic tasks; otherwise the members are more aptly described as a coresident group. This one determinant—group cooperation—is an especially relevant factor when studying slave households. As mentioned, historians believe the personnel of many slave quarters, especially in the early years, tended to consist of unrelated individuals living in dwellings that functioned as barracks. Presumably, the various members of these barracks did not at first cooperate in the performance of domestic tasks, or the degree of cooperation was limited to a few minor tasks. This living situation would not constitute a household, but rather a coresident

two general subcategories. Wilk and Netting outline one of the most widely

addressed this dilemma in her own work by defining plantation communities as "households," and proposing that "all of the members of an evolving field quarter formed a single, enclosed 'household'" (1997:53).

group.⁹ As slaves formed alliances over time, coresident groups transformed into households and in some cases these households were comprised of family members.

To distinguish between a coresidential group and a household, archaeologists must develop the capability to isolate the phenomenon of cooperation in the archaeological record. It may be possible to identify a sense of cooperation within a housing unit by comparing the ambient factors with one another and considering social alliances as one explanation of any perceived variation. For instance, most enslaved individuals forced to live in groups eventually recognized the advantages of cooperating with housemates in the performance of domestic tasks. Indeed, cooperation allowed members to harness their labor and apply it more efficiently than they could otherwise do alone. Therefore, in the case of slave quarters, the size of dwellings may have shifted over time as builders responded to the changing relationships and needs of the inhabitants as they increasingly formed alliances. The use of storage spaces inside the dwellings may have changed as well. And the amounts of some artifact types may have differed between groups sharing domestic tasks and pooling labor, compared with those acting independently of one another. Like most archaeological evidence, whatever differences may be present in the data will be difficult to pin down, and ultimately the proof may be inconclusive. Still, it is worth the effort to consider residency patterns as one explanation for architectural, spatial, and artifactual variation at slave quarters.

As a means to study domestic tasks within households, researchers often divide the tasks into general subcategories. Wilk and Netting outline one of the most widely

⁹ Maria Franklin addressed this dilemma in her own work by defining plantation communities as households, and proposing that "all of the members of an outlying field quarter formed a single, enslaved subhousehold" (1997:53).

cited sets of functional categories by dividing household activities into five categories: production, distribution (consumption), transmission (of property and goods), reproduction (and socialization of children), and coresidence (1984:5). While there is a good deal of latitude in defining these activities, this household classificatory system is based on economic parameters and as such, it may not be entirely applicable to slave households, again especially during the earliest decades of slavery. For example, under these criteria, only coresidence, reproduction, and possibly distribution apply directly to slave households. The capacity to carry out production and transmission within a slave household was severely hampered, if not impossible.

Historians have found that most Chesapeake slaves were unable to control with whom they lived until the mid-18th century. Instead, most were assigned to living quarters. Often the size of the dwelling determined the size and composition of the residency unit (see Wilk and Netting 1984:17). As productive units, the majority of a slave's labor benefited the master, with little or no gain for the residency group. Production was not necessary to sustain a residency group, although during off-hours many slaves did generate resources that potentially could have been pooled within the housing unit (see Franklin 1997:50). For instance, depending upon the internal arrangement, slaves may have contributed game acquired from hunting or fishing forays to the household, or households may have tended to communal gardens. Yet, from an economic standpoint, slave household production was highly unstable because the master ultimately controlled membership. Moreover, the stability of a living unit was not contingent upon sustaining productivity or pooling resources, therefore slaves in residence together often lacked two key elements of production, leadership and

organization. Given this, a household classification system primarily based on economic criteria does not entirely encompass the typical slave residential unit prior to the mid-18th century.

As the American Revolution approached, some masters began to provide housing for specific families of slaves (see Kulikoff 1977a, 1986; Morgan 1998). Although the master still ultimately determined membership of these housing units, during the second half of the 18th century slaves earned more control over them. In some cases these residency groups could be managed as economic units. Or at the very least, slaves had more opportunities to mobilize production, pool resources, strategize distribution, organize reproduction, determine membership, and perhaps even to transmit personal property to one another. Not all masters provided these privileges, but a general trend was established that had a dramatic effect on the composition of the typical slave living unit.

Evidently, any analysis of slave residency patterns must take into account the many unique factors that shaped them. The standard set of analytical methods for studying households may not apply completely to the slave housing units, at least not without major modifications (see Morgan 1998:499). However, studies have shown the general character of Chesapeake slave housing units did change over time (Berlin 1998:109-141; Morgan 1998:497-550). Slaves acquired more control over with whom they resided, and the members of these later residency units were more likely to have conjugal or consanguineal connections.

Household Archaeology

By virtue of the fact that household settings are one of the best sources of artifacts, households have always been the focus of archaeological study, whether explicitly or not. However, it was only in the 1960s that archaeologists began to consider the household as a valid unit of study, not just a convenient place to find data. Prior to that most archaeological studies concentrated on whole cultures, millennial sequences of change, and broad classifications of stylistic variation, what some have labeled a culture-history approach (see Wilk and Rathje 1982:617; Trigger 1989:186-206).

In the 1950s and 1960s some archaeologists began to pursue a new archaeological focus, looking at subsistence economies, population size, and settlement patterns in a movement later termed *settlement archaeology* (Trigger 1989:279). Gordon Willey is considered one of the originators of settlement archaeology, as he and a cadre of followers began to concentrate on complete settlements and variability between them (ibid.:282; Wilk and Rathje 1982:617; Ashmore and Wilk 1988:7). As developed by Willey and others, settlement pattern data were used to study the economic, social, and political transformations of various societies. Perhaps most importantly, settlement archaeologists explained changes in the archaeological record due to "internal transformations" rather than attributing all change to external causes such as ecological or evolutionary events (Trigger 1989:284). Advancements in settlement archaeology eventually led archaeologists to divide settlement patterns into a "hierarchy of levels" that spanned from micro-scale activity areas within structures, to the structures themselves, to the activity areas around structures, to communities, and to macro-scale regional networks of communities (ibid.:284-285). These gradual changes in the locus of

archaeological study coincided with the development of dramatic new theoretical approaches in the field in what would become known as the New Archaeology (ibid.:294-303; Binford 1962a).

Household archaeology consequently developed out of settlement archaeology as one of its smaller units of analysis. Household archaeologists confined their focus to single housing units, households, and activity areas. Seeking to intensively study houses and what they called household clusters, Kent Flannery and his colleagues published one of the first comprehensive household archaeology studies (1976). Flannery chose the household level of analysis because "The variation between houses within a village can be one of our best sources of information about the variation between families—variation in subsistence, division of labor, craft activity, social status, and so on" (ibid.:16). He also studied internal variation within individual households by isolating groups of artifacts that could be associated with specific activities, possibly delineating between female and male work areas (see Flannery and Winter 1976).

Today, many archaeologists regard the household unit as the essential building block of past societies (Wilk and Rathje 1982:619). The household level of archaeological analysis not only allows for study of individuals and small groups, but it also may "bridge" the gap between "grand theories of culture change and evolution and the practical archaeology of potsherds and stone tools" (ibid.:617). Indeed, many archaeologists have embraced the household level of archaeological analysis as a means to connect a set of raw data with larger cultural principles, always remaining "mindful of those ways in which the household is the receptacle of the cultural codes that govern its structure and actions" (Deetz 1982:723).

As a whole, historical archaeologists have produced surprisingly few studies that address issues such as household organization, development, or relations. Two decades ago Mary Beaudry championed the need for more historical archaeologies focused on the household developmental cycle (1982). While acknowledging the formidable methodological obstacles impeding household archaeology, Beaudry encouraged her fellow historical archaeologists to recover "all of the information pertaining to the entire spectrum of on-site activities that relate to household function" (ibid.:35). Returning to the topic seven years later, Beaudry conceded that "domestic sites of the historical period have seldom been examined from what can truly be called a household-oriented perspective" (1989:84-85). Not for lack of trying, Beaudry's exhortations largely have fallen on deaf ears.

Aside from Maria Franklin's archaeological examination of an 18th-century slave quarter household located outside Williamsburg, Virginia (1997), no archaeological case studies of African-American or slave households have been produced. While most excavations of slave sites take place in domestic contexts—houses, quarters, habitation areas, yards—virtually none of the projects have focused on issues such as household composition, development, organization, or relations. This is not because of a shortage of case studies. In the Chesapeake alone archaeological studies of slave or African-American housing units number in the dozens (e.g., Noel Hume 1968; Kelso 1984, 1997; McKee 1988; Parker and Hernigle 1990; Pogue and White 1991; Yentsch 1994; Franklin 1997; Heath 1999; Samford 2000), while outside of the Chesapeake, most archaeological case studies of African Americans or slaves have been conducted at a household scale (e.g., Ascher and Fairbanks 1971; Fairbanks 1972; Wheaton et al. 1983; Otto 1984;

Armstrong 1990; Brown and Cooper 1990; McKelway et al. 2000). Still, in almost every project the prevailing focus has been on either identifying material evidence of an African heritage, or isolating the living conditions experienced by slaves (see Singleton 1995; Singleton and Bograd 1995). Few have chosen to delve deeper into the internal social dynamics of slave relations or confront issues of household or family development. In explaining her own motivation to do so, Franklin explains, "a majority of enslaved Africans probably felt that their families, and by extension their households, consisted of the relationships they valued most" (1997:22). For that reason alone, it would seem productive to focus on households and families at places such as the Utopia Quarter.

Historiography of the Slave Family

Once landed in the New World slaves proceeded to form social connections, coalitions, and alliances with one another. To not do so meant remaining in social isolation. Sometimes these initial interchanges occurred between shipmates during the Middle Passage (Mintz and Price 1992:43-44). More commonly, upon reaching the final destination, whether a farm, plantation, or factory, slaves allied with one another as a means of survival against the brutalities of enslavement. The chances of establishing a lasting friendship, much less finding a mate, were discouraging in most cases. Initially, many owners enacted measures to prevent or limit social intercourse among their slaves, especially conjugal partnerships, believing family and community solidarity would hinder productivity (see Kolchin 1993:50; Walsh 1997:83-85). Eventually, however, slaves overcame the uneven sex ratios, the internal cultural differences, the language barriers, the lack of privacy, and the group lodging to find spouses, produce children and form

families. By doing so slaves established core relationships resulting in a better quality of life.

Exactly what kinds of alliances and eventually what kinds of families African-American slaves formed has remained a point of controversy over the years, manipulated by social scientists, historians, and even politicians. The historiography on the topic has gone through at least three major cycles of revision. However, still today, relatively little is known about the patterns and processes of family and household formation at specific places such as the Utopia Quarter, or for the larger Chesapeake region. This is especially so for the pre-Revolutionary period in the 17th and 18th centuries. Most of the scholarship on slave and African-American families has been confined to discussions of general trends during the antebellum and postbellum years throughout the American South (e.g., Blassingame 1972; Fogel and Engerman 1974; Genovese 1976; Gutman 1976), although a few of the available studies focus on the Chesapeake region in the 18th century (i.e., Kulikoff 1977a, 1978, 1986:352-380; Norton et al. 1983; Sobel 1987; Stevenson 1996a; Walsh 1997; Morgan 1998:498-558), and one important case study specifically examines slave family and household structure in 19th-century Louisiana (Malone 1992).

Writing almost a century ago in one of the first book-length studies of the African-American family under slavery, W.E.B. Du Bois reluctantly concluded that the horrors and indignities of slavery had resulted in "the practically complete crushing out of the African clan and family life" (1908 [1969]:21), leaving enslaved Africans with few if any guiding principles or tools to reorganize into families. The legacy of slavery, Du Bois argued, was the continuing disruption of stable family life for the vast majority of

African Americans after emancipation and up to his present day, the early 20th century (see also Frazier 1930, 1939 [2001]; Stampp 1956; Myrdal 1964; Rainwater and Yancey 1967; Elkins 1976). *The Case for National Action* (Rainwater and Yancey 1967:44-124).

Following Du Bois' lead, E. Franklin Frazier devoted his career to studying the African-American family sociologically, both during and after slavery. The main thread that held together Frazier's work was his thesis that slavery irrevocably destroyed an African cultural heritage and thereby seriously impaired the development of the African-American family (1930, 1932, 1939 [2001], 1949). Frazier accepted, perhaps too readily, that the contemporary urban African-American family was dysfunctional (see Platt 2001) and painted a bleak picture: "The widespread disorganization of family life among Negroes has affected practically every phase of their community life . . . Because of the absence of stability in family life . . . Life among a large portion of the urban Negro population is casual, precarious, and fragmentary" (Frazier 1949:636). This he reasoned was due almost entirely to the pathological effects inherited from generations of enslavement (see also Myrdal 1964:930-935).¹⁰

The perspective Du Bois and Frazier developed on the African-American family quietly dominated the thinking on the subject up to the 1960s. For those relatively few historians and social scientists who touched on the subject, most did not question that slavery had damaged irreparably the development of healthy, stable African-American families (e.g., Stampp 1956:340-349; Rainwater and Yancey 1967; Elkins 1976; Parish

¹⁰ Because of his unflinching critique of African-American families, Frazier tends to be unfairly demonized in some circles. But as an African-American scholar, neither racism nor malice against African Americans motivated Frazier's scholarship and he was something of an early Civil Rights pioneer (Gutman 1975:184; Platt 2001:xxiii-xxiv).

1989:85; Davis 1997).¹¹ The condition of the African-American family gained national attention in 1965 with the publication of Daniel Patrick Moynihan's controversial report, *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* (Rainwater and Yancey 1967:44-124). In an effort to mobilize public policy reform, Moynihan characterized the African-American family as a "tangle of pathology" that resulted in "deep-seated structural distortions in the life of the Negro American" (ibid.:93). Echoing Frazier, Moynihan reasoned that the problems of the contemporary African-American family stemmed from social and economic sources, all linked to slavery (Rainwater and Yancey 1967:44-124; see also Stamp 1956:344; Gutman 1976:xvii; Dodson 1988:79). Intended as a prescription for sweeping social change, the Moynihan Report instead triggered a political and historical uproar (Elkins 1976:271-273; Davis 1997:102).

In response to Moynihan, sociologists and civil rights activists defended the modern African-American family, finding optimism in a growing African-American middle class, an improved educational system, and the successful fight to end segregation (Rainwater and Yancey 1967:133-313). Sociologists challenged the view that the social and economic ills of the contemporary African-American family were linked to slavery (e.g., Billingsley 1968; Staples 1971; 1973; Hill 1972; Furstenberg, Hershberg, and Modell 1975). And a legion of revisionist historians in the 1970s cited examples of African Americans who overcame the constraints of slavery and racism to form enduring networks of family and kin (Blassingame 1972:149-191; Wood 1974; Fogel and Engerman 1974; Higman 1975, 1978; Genovese 1976; Gutman 1976; Huggins 1977;

¹¹ For instance, in his authoritative history of antebellum slave life, Kenneth Stamp accepted the proposition that for slaves "the family had nothing like the social significance that it had in the life of the white man" (1956:343).

Kulikoff 1977a; 1978; Rose 1982). Exciting new information surfaced from the revisionists that the majority of slaves lived in stable nuclear families, and continued to do so after emancipation (see Gutman 1975; 1976).

The revisionists acknowledged the factors that impeded stable family life—the perpetual threat of separation, no legal sanction of marriage, and no ultimate authority over children—but accentuated the efforts of slaves to overcome these obstacles (see Blassingame 1972:149-191; Rawick 1972; Fogel and Engerman 1974:5, 141-142; Genovese 1976:450-458; Owens 1976:191-213; Huggins 1977:161-172). The strongest proponent of the stable slave nuclear family among the revisionists was Herbert Gutman who published an authoritative reanalysis of the structure of African-American families, both before and after slavery (1976). While conceding the potential disruptions slavery placed on marriages, Gutman presented evidence that the majority of slave couples in the antebellum period and immediately after emancipation maintained long, stable relationships, and lived in two-parent households headed by a husband (ibid.:11-14, 137, 155, 414-418). As proof of the continuity of slave families Gutman cited an inveterate system of slave naming patterns and the importance of kinship connections that cut across several generations (Gutman 1976:189-225).

In hindsight, most would agree that on virtually all subjects Gutman “overstated his case” in his eagerness to refute the arguments of Frazier, Moynihan, and others (Parish 1989:88; see also Davis 1997:102). It is clear that in their zeal to defend the slave family Gutman and many of the other revisionists portrayed slave life as far too rosy, an almost idyllic existence of cooperation and harmony only modestly inconvenienced by the absence of freedom (Kolchin 1983:581; see also Rose 1982:31; Parish 1989:78-79;

Blight 1995:4-5; Davis 1997:102-103; Patterson 1998:29). To that end, Gutman and others virtually eliminated the role of the slave owners "to the level of background noise" (Fogel 1989:167). The original overemphasis of the damage slavery imposed on its victims as asserted by Du Bois, Frazier, Moynihan, and others had been replaced by a version of slave history that dismissed enslavement as an almost irrelevant factor shaping African-American family life.

As a corrective to Gutman and the other revisionists, a group of counter revisionist historians emerged in the 1980s and 1990s to provide a third cycle of rewriting African-American family history (e.g., J. Jones 1985; White 1985; Fox-Genovese 1988; Malone 1992; Stevenson 1996a; Patterson 1998).¹² The counter revisionists have forged a middle ground between the early assessments of the historic African-American family as fragmented and unstable, and the later revisionist appraisals of those same families as healthy and stable. Most of the counter revisionists see the condition of the slave family as contingent upon a variety of outside forces such as the time period, geographic location, regional economy, population profile, and transatlantic slave-trade patterns, as well as internal dynamics of each plantation as they concern size, sex ratio, ethnic composition, agriculture, and the background of the slave master (Berlin 1980; Boles 1983:30, 48; Steckel 1992:144; Stevenson 1996a:207-210; Patterson 1998:30-31). In addition to context, researchers acknowledge that the cultural norms and backgrounds of the thousands of West and Central African people stolen in the slave trade played a decisive role in the types of families and households that developed in New World

¹² The term *counter revisionist* has been borrowed from Patterson (1998:29).

settings (i.e., Norton et al. 1983; Kulikoff 1986; Sobel 1987; Malone 1992; Mintz and Price 1992; Stevenson 1996a; Walsh 1997; Berlin 1998; Morgan 1998).

Many of the counter revisionists challenged the earlier analyses of slave families by deconstructing the terminology used to describe them. For example, it has been pointed out that Frazier, Moynihan, and others assumed that "disorganization" in African-American families stemmed from their matrifocal form (Farnham 1987:68). Or a lack of male authority was *prima facie* evidence of family instability (Robertson 1996:12-13). Furthermore, until recently, most scholars unquestioningly accepted the ethnocentric notion that a nuclear family provided the most "stable" family setting. Most of the revisionists, according to Orlando Patterson, assumed implicitly "that what they called 'the family' meant only one thing: the suburban, nuclear unit to which they were accustomed" (1998:29; see also Farnham 1987:68; Mintz and Price 1992:65).¹³ This has created a situation whereupon African-American families are expected to adopt Anglo-American cultural norms or otherwise they are considered underdeveloped (Staples and Johnson 1993:20).

The counter revisionists have begun to disengage some of the more controversial aspects of the slave family debate into three separate (but interconnected) areas of discussion: the types of slave families, their forms, and how the slave family functioned as a unit. The debate concerning the types of slave families centers on the issue of matrifocality or woman-headed households. Since Frazier, the question of whether enslaved men were able to govern their families, or whether that role fell to women has

¹³ Historian Brenda Stevenson points out "it still is difficult to ascertain what 'family' must have meant to those first African and creole blacks" (1996a:207). Indeed, the concept of family is wide open to interpretation.

been the most hotly disputed of the slave family topics. As to the form of slave families, the question revolves around the issue of the nuclear family. Some researchers claim that nuclear forms of family—mother, father, children in the same household—predominated, while others disagree, feeling that either the nature of slavery did not allow most slaves to create this family form, or that slaves rejected the nuclear form altogether for something more closely resembling an extended family. The discussion surrounding the function of the slave family concerns the gender roles that men and women assumed in the household and whether or not leadership was egalitarian. These sub-issues—matrifocal type, nuclear form, and egalitarian gender roles—are interrelated and all helped determine the degree of stability or instability of slave families.

Slave Family Types

Thinking on matrifocal slave households continues to change and evolve. Most researchers acknowledge that women played a distinctive role within the slave family that differed in scope and scale from that of women in planter families (J. Jones 1985:3-43; White 1985:142-160; Fox-Genovese 1988:48-49). The earlier belief that women controlled a matriarchal household and somehow were to blame for the problems experienced by slave families has been put to rest as a myth (Davis 1971; Shifflett 1975:235-238; McAdoo 1988; Malone 1992:258-263; Robertson 1996:12-13). A matrifocal family has been defined as one where “the mother plays a substantial role in providing subsistence and making decisions” (Robertson 1996:11-12). Given this, it is fair to say that decision making and subsistence needs were handled by both men and women in slave family groups, depending upon circumstances.

¹⁴ Many researchers point out that female-headed households are almost always a sign of economic deprivation and poverty, not female domination or empowerment (Staples 1973:18-23; Hall 1990; Robertson 1996:17).

A consensus has now developed that African forms of family organization allowed enslaved women some amount of autonomy not available to women in Anglo-American families.¹⁴ For instance, it was common to find a mother and her children residing in a separate residence from the father in many African societies, and this would have been an acceptable practice under slavery (Farnham 1987:81). Slavery reinforced the matrilocality of most slave families; that is, the children remained with their mother rather than their father if the couple lived apart (J. Jones 1985:32; see also Kolchin 1993:140-141). However, the absence of slave men from their families usually was not by choice, but due to the terror of the slave system—sale, transfer, punishment, hiring out—under which these families lived (see Malone 1992:259; Robertson 1996:11). Thus, women often assumed primary responsibility for sustaining a household, but this role hardly conferred those women with much autonomy or power outside of the walls of their quarters (Billingsley 1992:116). Most of those wives who lived outside the direct control of their husbands hardly had the luxury as slaves to view the circumstance as liberating, and probably would have preferred living with their spouses, if given the option.

Just how many slave families had both parents in residence together also has been a matter of heated debate. Still today many accept Gutman's thesis without question that the typical slave household contained a mother, father, and children (see J. Jones 1985:32; White 1985:32; Kolchin 1987:208; Mintz and Kellogg 1988:67, 79-80; Fogel 1989:150; Malone 1992:258; Kolchin 1993:138-139; Robertson 1996:14). Indeed, for 19th-century slaves the two-parent family seems to have served as the prototype, and a

¹⁴ Many researchers point out that female-headed households are almost always a sign of economic deprivation and poverty, not female domination or empowerment (Staples 1973:18-23; Dill 1990; Robertson 1996:17).

slim majority achieved it (see J. Jones 1985; White 1985; Fox-Genovese 1988; Malone 1992). However, the internal organization of the 18th-century slave family is more difficult to determine with any precision (see Boles 1983:41; Mullin 1992:173). Recent histories of 18th-century Chesapeake slavery suggest that nuclear families were not necessarily the norm, although the potential stability of each slave family was contingent upon many factors, not the least of which was how each planter chose to manage his people (see Kulikoff 1977a; 1978; 1986:352-380; Walsh 1997:81-92; Berlin 1998:129-133; Morgan 1998:498-552). For example, only one in six slaves belonging to George Washington in 1799 could claim to cohabit with a spouse and children (Stevenson 1996b:178), whereas well over half the slaves owned by Charles Carroll of Annapolis, Maryland, in 1773 did so (Norton et al. 1983:178). It seems clear from this that there was no conventional form for the slave family in the 18th-century Chesapeake; however, the probability of living in a nuclear family had improved enough by the second quarter of the 19th century that more than half the slaves in the American South lived under the same roof with a spouse and children.

For those slave families with both a husband and wife in residence, researchers have begun to consider critically how men and women shared decision-making and household gender roles. By all accounts, in the first half of the 18th century planters imposed virtually no gender division of labor on their slaves (Davis 1981:8; hooks 1981:45; White 1985:114; Carr and Walsh 1988; Brown 1996:119). Enslaved men and women both worked in the fields side by side doing the same jobs, and were counted equally as full hands (Shammas 1985:10; Walsh 1993:177; Yentsch 1994:173, 176, 367). In the Chesapeake, only when agricultural shifts caused changes in the plantation work

routine in the mid- to late 18th century did planters begin to assign different tasks to men and women (Morgan 1988; Walsh 1993:186). Primarily slave men were assigned skilled jobs providing them, within the realm of the slave institution, with upward mobility, while most enslaved women continued to be relegated to the lowliest jobs on the plantation, unskilled, backbreaking field labor (Boles 1983:46; Walsh 1993:186). On the larger plantations some slave women moved into domestic positions in the main house, but most continued to toil in field gangs, retiring to the slave quarters at night (see Morgan 1998:172-175, 187-194). With these changes, men increasingly worked by a task system that allowed them to work independently of supervision and afforded many of them more leisure time, whereas women continued to work in closely supervised gangs (Walsh 1993; e.g., Morgan 1988).

The overall effect of this widening divide between men's and women's roles was to reinforce the presence of women in the slave household, whereas men expanded their opportunities to live and work outside of it (Kolchin 1993:140-141). Even though the majority of men and women labored in fields together, the growing division of labor tended to confer greater mobility on men (White 1985:75). Pregnancy, child rearing, and domestic work restricted women to the plantation. In the case of abroad marriages it was more common for husbands to travel to visit wives and children, in large part because property rights over children were determined by the matrilineal line and children were less able to walk great distances (Mann 1990:149; Walsh 1997). Thus, enslaved men co-opted the wider landscapes, those paths that crisscrossed between plantations, as an "alternative territorial system" (Isaac 1982:53), leaving women to shape the domestic spaces in and around the quarters at places such as Utopia.

While the statuses of slave women and men as laborers had changed over the course of the 18th century, within the slave household most counter revisionists consider gender relations to have been "unusually egalitarian," probably more so than what prevailed in planter families at the time (White 1985:158; 1991:121; Robertson 1996:15; see also Davis 1971, 1981). The egalitarian perspective promoted by the counter revisionists echoes the revisionists 20 years earlier, but instead of the men giving up or sharing power with their spouses, slave couples acted with one another in complementary roles (see White 1985:158-159). Some researchers suggest that the debilitating nature of enslavement prompted women and men to set aside a strict division of labor to share equally the burden of domestic work (Davis 1981:18). Others propose the opposite; in an effort to establish gender identity women and men created a conspicuous division of labor in their households (J. Jones 1989:197). As egalitarian as the relationships between enslaved men and women may or may not have been, the household generally functioned as a woman's domain; in large part women bore the children and took on the lion's share of child rearing, including cooking and cleaning. In that case, then, most women took on a double burden as laborer by day and caregiver by night, meaning for many of them family life offered more inequality than equality (Robertson 1996:21; see also Staples 1973:13-14; Huggins 1977:168; Bush 1986:124; Yentsch 1994:176).

Regarding the African-American family, Andrew Billingsley makes a sobering observation that probably held true for most slaves: "... power in the slave family resided in neither the slave husband nor the slave wife but with the white owner, often delegated to the white overseer and supported by the force and violence of the slave

¹⁵ Janet Choletz cautions that the gender status inequalities within disadvantaged groups such as slaves may be reduced, not because women have greater status, but because men's access to resources is also limited (in Spain 1992:235).

system" (1992:106; see also Mintz and Price 1992:76-77).¹⁵ Whether a slave was fortunate enough to live among loved ones ultimately was a decision made by someone else, and the gender roles that each man and woman negotiated between them could not guarantee the sanctity of the relationship. Family stability was a concept that no slave could fully realize no matter how much equality each family member allotted one another.

Household and Family at the Utopia Quarter

As it stands today, the subject of the African-American family and its level of "stability" remains unresolved. Most social scientists who have wrestled with the issues surrounding the slave family can agree that families formed a principal stronghold to withstand the ravages of enslavement (see Morgan 1998:497). Just how many slaves were able to find haven within families, and how much protection they provided continues to be examined and debated. Archaeological studies at places such as the Utopia Quarter can begin to address these issues, providing tangible clues about families and households in the form of dwelling houses, sub-floor pits, and the assemblages of artifacts they left behind.

It is almost certain that the first generations of slaves to arrive at Utopia did not live in families, at least at the beginning. Families took time to form in stages, gradually growing from coresident groups, to households, and eventually into groups of kin residing together. Since family is a fundamental institution that provides pleasure, sustenance, personal fulfillment, and care, I have assumed that at places such as Utopia

¹⁵ Janet Chafetz cautions that the gender status inequalities within disadvantaged groups such as slaves may be reduced, not because women have greater status, but because men's access to resources is also limited (in Spain 1992:235).

most slaves aspired to form alliances, find spouses, and bear children as a means to create new families. This is supported by the historical literature that indicates that the number of slave families in the Chesapeake increased throughout the 18th century, and as this occurred, the contact between and the stability of those families improved. For instance, a slave family living at Utopia in 1710 was less likely to reside under the same roof or to have a say in their living arrangements compared to that same family 50 years later in 1760. Slavery as a system was in constant flux as slaves tried to manipulate it to their advantage, and slave masters grappled to maintain authority and control. As this tenuous process of give and take evolved, slaves gradually were able to alter the slave system to be more responsive to their needs, and the potential for a gratifying family life improved. This means that at Utopia in 1710 James Bray II or his overseer likely dictated the living arrangements for each slave. But by the mid-18th century when Lewis Burwell IV owned Utopia, it is plausible that the majority of his slaves negotiated, perhaps even determined, where they lived and with whom.

CHAPTER III.

THE CONTEXT OF HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY AT UTOPIA

Nothing belongs to us anymore; they have taken away our clothes, our shoes, even our hair . . . they will even take away our name: and if we want to keep it, we will have to find ourselves the strength to do so, to manage somehow so that behind the name something of us, of us as we were, still remains.

Primo Levi (1958 [1996]:27),
remarking on his experiences at Dachau

Over the course of roughly 100 years of activity at the Utopia Quarter, the prospect of finding a spouse, bearing children, and acquiring some amount of family continuity was dependent upon a range of factors, some of them cultural, others demographic, and still others historical. First and foremost, I suggest that the households and families that enslaved Africans developed at Utopia were formed by processes of creolization. Creolization describes how cultures change when they come into contact with each other. Throughout the Chesapeake creolization is the means by which multiple cultures mixed to form something new, essentially a hybrid culture that contained elements of several parent cultures. Enslaved Africans formed households and families based on what they knew from their lives before slavery, and they were influenced by the Anglo-American (and perhaps Native American) households and families they encountered in the New World. From this, enslaved Africans eventually formed a new culture, one that was and is distinctly African American, parts of which can be traced back to Africa, Europe, and North America.

Within the creolization mixing bowl, probably the most significant set of factors that influenced family and household at Utopia, particularly in the early years, were the cultural backgrounds and personal values of the initial generations of slaves living at the site. Slaves had some degree of internal control over conceptions about proper gender

roles, social hierarchy, and kinship that contributed to the overall form and function of families and households. Whether or not they were able to replicate their perceptions of family and household is another matter dependent upon a second set of external demographic factors that were outside of their control, things such as time period, location, regional economy, demography, and the rate of the transatlantic slave trade. A third set of factors influencing family and household at Utopia were linked to the internal demographic setting—the size and sex ratio of the quarter, its ethnic composition, the type of tasks they performed, the socioeconomic standing of Pettus, the Brays, and Burwell, and the management strategy each imposed upon his slaves. These more specific historical factors, coupled with the larger demographic issues and the slaves' own cultural views of their world shaped the rate, the form, and the timing of the creolization of households and families at Utopia (see Mintz and Price 1992:67).

The main purpose of this chapter is to dissect the primary cultural, demographic, and historical factors that contributed to the growth of households and families at places comparable to the Utopia Quarter. First I review the concept of creolization and how it likely functioned at places like Utopia. Second, to achieve a cultural perspective, I discuss West and Central African conceptions of kinship and gender roles, the two cultural qualities that contributed most directly to African family structure, and how these values might have been expressed by generations of Chesapeake slaves. Third, I review the current state of understanding about slave families and households in the 18th-century Chesapeake and consider which historical factors had the most significant implications for family and household growth. Several recent Chesapeake historians have sorted the stages of slave family and community development into chronological phases. These

phases are reviewed and compared to the four occupation periods at Utopia. In this same section I evaluate a set of case studies drawn together by historians examining the composition of 18th-century Chesapeake slave residency units.

The Processes of Creolization

African-American culture as it is understood today by many scholars is considered to be the result of creolization (see Berlin 1980:45n3). According to Edward Brathwaite, the term *creole* (or *criollo*) originated in Spain and originally defined a "committed settler . . . native to the settlement though not ancestrally indigenous to it" (1971:xiv-xv). By the early 17th century, the word had entered the English vocabulary, defined as "one who was born in the colonies," especially in reference to West Indies-born Spanish settlers (Oxford English Dictionary [OED] 1989). There appears to be no credible evidence that Chesapeake slaves identified themselves as creoles, although their masters may have (Franklin 1997:5). To this day the local uses of the word vary widely; in some cases it references people of mixed races, or it may describe vernacular foodways, music, or languages (see Mouer 1993:108-110).

Whereas the word *creole* has been in use for several centuries, the term *creolization* emerged in the 1930s and began to see regular use in linguistic circles in the late 1960s and early 1970s (OED 1989). Social scientists quickly adopted the concept of creolization as one of the more popular means to describe African-American culture change, especially on pre-Civil War plantations, although it is not limited exclusively to African-American culture or to plantations (see Brathwaite 1971; Deagan 1983, 1996; Joyner 1984, 1989; Ferguson 1992; Mintz and Price 1992; Deetz 1996; Franklin 1997; Dawdy 2000). Although there are many definitions of creolization, most would agree

that it is applicable to “multicultural adjustment . . . which entails interaction, exchange, and creativity” between masters and slaves (Ferguson 1992:xli). As applied to the Utopia Quarter, over time the slaves there shaped a new culture that combined identifiable components of African cultures with European cultures, and perhaps even vestiges of Native American cultures. The end product was something that had links to them all, but was entirely different too.

Charles Joyner adopted creolization as an explanatory tool to describe cultural changes that took place among 19th-century enslaved Africans living on the Sea Islands of South Carolina and Georgia (1984). He portrays creolization as a linguistic analogy, suggesting that culture is comprised of two integral parts, a grammar and a lexicon. The cultural grammar is the way people do things, what Mintz and Price (1992:10) label “widespread underlying principles” or what James Deetz has called “socially transmitted rules for behavior” (1996:35). The lexicon is the means through which the grammar is expressed. Joyner suggests that among enslaved Africans the “English contribution was principally lexical; the African contribution was principally grammatical” (1984:xxi). For example, in terms of cuisine, slaves “adopted the grains, fruits, vegetables, and meats of the New World environment, but to those foodstuffs they applied an African culinary grammar—methods of cooking and spicing, remembered recipes, ancestral tastes” (Joyner 1989:148). Significantly, the creolized meals that slaves blended together were not strictly English, nor African, but something new, something African and American in form.

Joyner’s conception of culture as comprising grammar and lexicon is perfectly tailored for use by historical archaeologists and a growing number of them have adopted

this approach (Ferguson 1992:xli-xliv; Mouer 1993:108-112; Deetz 1996:213; Franklin 1997; Mouer et al. 1999:112-113). Leland Ferguson applies a creolization model where "material things are part of the lexicon of culture while the ways they are made, used, and perceived are part of the grammar or structure" (Ferguson 1992:xlii; see also Joyner 1984:xxi). One of the classic illustrations of this phenomenon is John Otto's work on a 19th-century Georgia plantation known as Cannon's Point. There, Otto argues that slaves predominantly used European and American-made bowls to consume most of their meals, in the process maintaining a cuisine of stews and soups common in West African cultures. On this same plantation, archaeological evidence indicates that the non-African residents—the planter family and overseers—dined primarily on flatwares, signaling an Anglo-American cultural heritage of individual portions and cuts of meat (Otto 1984:66-68, 167, 173-174). Thus, while the ceramics (the lexicon) the slaves used originated in Europe, the way they used ceramic vessels (the grammar) can be traced to Africa. In this instance slaves expressed aspects of an African heritage with non-African objects.

In terms of the households and families that enslaved Africans formed, under the Joyner model these too were something new, found in neither parent culture but instead consisting of both Anglo-American and African parts. The material backdrop (the lexicon) for household and family formation almost always was European-American, consisting of English vernacular houses, made with materials native to the Chesapeake, and stocked with European-American goods.¹ The ways in which enslaved Africans

¹ There is some degree of disagreement regarding the influence of African building practices at Chesapeake slave quarters (see Morton 1956:76, Carson 1974; Glassie 1975; Genovese 1976:528; Carson et al. 1981; Upton 1982; Abrahams and Szwed 1983:52; Herman 1984:277-278; Jones 1985:196, 200; Neiman 1987:3113-3116; Sobel 1987:115-126; Vlach 1990:122-138; Edwards 1991; Vlach 1993:153-182; Deetz 1996:214-231).

inhabited the houses, how space inside was organized, and how objects were put to use, constitutes the grammar of households and families. Eventually, enslaved Africans and their American-born descendants crafted together novel types of households and families that had traits in common with culture groups on several continents, but were distinctly unique as well.

Cultural Factors Shaping Household and Family at Utopia

The trajectory of slave household and family development depended on an assortment of factors, not the least of which were the deeply imbedded notions of how families were supposed to function that the enslaved brought with them from Africa. Most historians and anthropologists are quick to point out that the transatlantic slave trade took people from diverse African cultures throughout West and Central Africa, and even from as far away as Madagascar (see Thomas 1997). Ways of living, family organization, gender roles, rites of passage, and religious beliefs differed from place to place. For example, family membership amongst the Akan peoples on the Gold Coast of West Africa was different from Igbo family membership in the Bight of Biafra region of the western coast (cf. Uchendu 1965; Chambers 1996; Gomez 1998:110-113, 124-134; Samford 2000). The prospect of determining cultural norms for a culturally heterogeneous population of African peoples in the Chesapeake is a harrowing enterprise. Recent studies of the transatlantic slave trade suggest that the origin of more than half the 18th-century African slaves arriving in the Chesapeake were from the Bight of Biafra, and thereby seemingly related to the Igbo culture group, with lower percentages from Senegambia and Angola (Walsh 2001; see also Curtin 1969:157; Kulikoff 1986:321; Miller 1988; Chambers 1996; Morgan 1998:63; Samford 2000). This means that a

considerable percentage of the enslaved Africans living at the Utopia Quarter probably were Igbo.² And yet, there is no certainty that Igbo cultural norms predominated at Utopia.

While urging caution, most historians and anthropologists will grant that the vast majority of African peoples caught up in the transatlantic slave trade shared some common cultural continuities, what Mintz and Price (1992:9-10) call a system of shared "values . . . which may underlie and shape behavioral response." Historians sketch a distinctive worldview shared by Africans, including an emphasis on family and community, an acceptance of polygamy, communal land ownership, a similar understanding of causality, an emphasis on taboo, magic, and ritual, an attachment of place with spiritual significance, and a cyclical perception of time (Sobel 1987:18-20; Kolchin 1993:42; see also Sudarkasa 1980:52; Boles 1983:40; Farnham 1987:70; Gomez 1998). This suggests that enslaved Africans from different culture areas in West and Central Africa who ended up at places like Utopia may have spoken different languages and had widely differing concepts of how to go about daily tasks, but their core values were often quite similar. For instance, for the Akan the concept of property rights over land belonged to the ancestors and was a source of corporate identity for the living, while for the Igbo the land was owned by lineages and was controlled by an earth mother deity (Gomez 1998:112-113, 128-129). If members of both cultures found themselves living at Utopia, it seems likely that they could have found common ground on the matter, both

² Patricia Samford's recent study of storage cellars at Utopia presents compelling evidence of a possible isolated Igbo connection, finding that some of the cellars may have been used as Igbo shrines (2000). It is clear from Samford's findings, and from other evidence, that members of the Igbo culture were present at Utopia, but whether they constituted a group dominant enough to impose Igbo norms remains uncertain.

understanding in this case that land had a powerful spiritual significance and must be respected.

Of all the shared cultural belief systems that converged at Utopia, beliefs concerning kinship and gender roles had the most influence on the structure of families and households. Kinship was the basis for linking people together into social units, and gender roles were the largest factor determining interaction within the social units. Kinship and gender roles were intimately tied together; any discussion of one will inevitably entail the other.

Kinship

For most West and Central African cultures kinship held the utmost importance, to the extent that "some features of kinship organization were almost universal" (Sudarkasa 1987:30).³ Therefore, probably without exception, the West-Central African slaves that found themselves at Utopia were from kin-based societies where a large portion of their identity was determined by their place within a lineage. For most of these people in the past and present, descent is unilineal, traced either through the mother or the father (see Radcliffe-Brown and Forde 1950; Fortes 1971:263-275; Sudarkasa 1980:38-40; 1988:30-31; Hill 1999:50-51). Neither a matrilineal nor a patrilineal system predominates, although patrilineages outnumber matrilineages in West Africa, and vice versa in Central Africa (Radcliffe-Brown and Forde 1950; Billingsley 1968:40; Treckel 1996:65-66). In either system, the children born to a mother belong either to her lineage

³ The primacy of African kinship is almost universally acknowledged by researchers. See Radcliffe-Brown and Forde 1950; Quarles 1969:16-17; Fortes 1971:263-275; Gutman 1976:219-229; Kulikoff 1986:347, 354; Mintz and Kellogg 1988:66-69; Nash 1982:182; Billingsley 1992:28; Mintz and Price 1992:66; Staples 1993:1-2; Robertson 1996:18-19; Patterson 1998:25-27.

or to the father's. In many cases the lineage functions as a corporate entity that controls ancestral lands (Radcliffe-Brown 1950:42; Sudarkasa 1980:40). Property and sometimes entitlements are transmitted through the lineages, not inherited from a spouse (Goody 1976).

Most lineages were, and still are exogamous, that is, members of a lineage are required to marry outside it (Sudarkasa 1980:40). This practice creates extended families drawn together through marriage. For example, in patrilineal societies a woman will become a member of her husband's lineage, but maintain her ties to her birth lineage. Yet, any children the woman might have belong to her husband's lineage (Billingsley 1968:41-42; Sudarkasa 1980:40). Many West-Central African cultures practice some form of polygamy, usually reserved for older men who have accumulated enough wealth to support more than one wife, while younger men remained monogamous until they have acquired the capital to expand their families with a second spouse (Billingsley 1968:42-43; Gutman 1976:331; Sudarkasa 1980:43; Fage 1989:154-155; Piersen 1996:92; Patterson 1998:26).

Unilocal residence patterns remain the most common in West-Central African societies, meaning one of the marriage partners leave his or her kin to take up residence with the kin of his or her spouse (Billingsley 1968:42). The majority of societies practice patrilocal residence, but a sizeable number also adhere to avunculocal patterns which entail living with a husband's uncle (ibid.; Ardener 1981:25). In any case, the essential point is that "when Africans got married, they did not 'start families,' they joined existing families" (Sudarkasa 1980:40). Lineages then normally consisted of a consanguineal core, often a group of siblings, and in-marrying spouses and the children they produced

(ibid. 1988:31). Mapped out on the ground, these lineage cores usually coresided together in an enclosed compound of adjacent structures, and continue to do so today (see Bourdier and Minh-ha 1985)

The majority of West-Central Africans living at Utopia would have referenced two kinds of families, an extended family consisting of coresidential kin living in a compound, and an immediate family consisting of the conjugal unit that coresided within the extended family compound (Sudarkasa 1980:43). Traditional residence patterns often dictated where and how individuals lived within the compound, and within the conjugal unit (see Billingsley 1968:43). Still today usually each man has his own space or separate dwelling for himself and his wife (or wives) and children within a compound. Although typically a husband and his wife or wives maintain segregated quarters, together they constitute a household unit that cooperates in the tasks of production, consumption, reproduction, and so on. The conjugal unit also contributes to the larger household unit formed by the extended family compound. Thus a conjugal unit is a semi-independent household forming part of a larger household made up of more conjugal units. The size of an African compound varies between a few conjugal units and their children to several hundred people linked by kinship. In the past usually one dominant man or several male elders of the same generation presided over an extended family compound, and this practice continues today (Sudarkasa 1987:32).

In Europe, America and much of the Western world, the family is defined by its conjugal core—a wife and husband who are responsible for organizing a household, making decisions, transmitting property, and socializing their children (Sudarkasa 1987:30-31). West-Central African families, on the other hand, are based on

consanguineal cores consisting of "adult siblings of the same sex or by larger same-sex segments of patri- or matrilineages" that form extended families that reside in compounds together (ibid.:31). In effect African families consist of households nested within households. Within this context, the burden of socializing children, economic production, consumption, distribution of goods, and transmission of property is shared by all households of the compound, and they form what amounts to the extended family (Sudarkasa 1980:46-48).

The strength and influence of contemporary West-Central African families resides in the extended family, not the nuclear or conjugal core, and this appears to have been the case historically (see Billingsley 1968:45; Hill 1999:51). If a husband and wife divorce or one dies, the extended family acts as a safety net to insure that the remaining family members are not left abandoned (see Hill 1999:50). All the children of a compound usually consider one another brothers and sisters, although frequently born of different fathers or mothers. Seniority among siblings was and is determined by age, and supersedes gender--older sisters retain more seniority than younger brothers, for example (Sudarkasa 1987:33). Indeed, the importance of conferring respect and reverence to elders is an essential characteristic of most African families (see ibid.:38; Billingsley 1992:94; Piersen 1996:94).

The network of extended family members is sacrosanct for most West-Central Africans, linking children, adults, and the elderly by way of the principles of respect, restraint, responsibility, and reciprocity (Sudarkasa 1980:50; see also Billingsley 1993:94-95). These obligations that members of a compound feel toward one another shape interpersonal relations in African societies, and played a powerful role in past

societies. By adhering to the principles of obligations to each other, extended families privilege the group over the individual. In fact, many African slaves entering the New World had to adjust to "a Western-type, ego-centered family" concentrated around a central individual, almost always a patriarch, instead of defining kinship through membership in a lineage (Robertson 1996:19-20; see also Nobles 1974; Boles 1983:41).

How did enslaved Africans replicate their kinship systems in a new and hostile world? Although most West-Central Africans arrived with fixed understandings of what constituted one's family, whether they were able to reconstitute a family was contingent upon a host of factors, most of which were outside their control. The end result, according to Orlando Patterson, was that "the organizational aspects of West African life, especially its elaborate, finely tuned lineage systems, simply could not be replicated in any form under the gulaglike prisons of the slave plantations" (Patterson 1998:26; see also Sudarkasa 1987:38; Robertson 1996:11). Like in West-Central Africa, the basic kin relationship under slavery was the mother-child dyad, the only relationship that could be guaranteed under slavery, at least temporarily. During its first years an infant needed its mother for sustenance and only the most callous slave owner dared to separate a mother from her child until it had reached a minimal age. Although there are examples of babies being sold away from their mothers, most children were not sold or otherwise separated from their mother until weaned, usually after age five or so, and even that was relatively rare (see Kulikoff 1986:357; Stevenson 1996:245-246; Morgan 1998:514-515). As time went on, in general, the odds of a slave mother and her child remaining together until adulthood improved. This was especially so for mothers and daughters, as slave owners were more willing to remove boys from their mothers than girls (Cody 1982; Patterson

1998:34-35). Under slavery conjugal and affinal ties were even more tenuous than consanguineal ones, dependent upon each slave owner's willingness to recognize slave unions (Sudarkasa 1987:34-35). And extended families related by blood as known from Africa were next to impossible to create until the 19th century, if at all.

Although the slaves' original kinship system was not replicable under slavery in America, vestiges of West-Central African kinship survived (Sudarkasa 1980:57). Slaves recreated some parts of extended family relationships. For instance, vast networks of fictive kin were constructed to substitute for consanguine relationships (Mintz and Price 1992:66; see also Boles 1983:41-42; Piersen 1996:94). Eventually, over a series of generations slaves were able to recreate "multifunctional mutual assistance kin groupings" (Sudarkasa 1980:56). Instead of living together in a compound, extended families could be dispersed across several counties and sometimes farther. These types of extended families lacked central leadership, but stayed in communication by a network of contacts—a husband living on a separate plantation might pass on news to his wife from a cousin during a visit, who could relay it to her sister and so on down the line. In essence, slave extended families often did not reside together, but a corporate system of communication kept people in contact.

In addition to refitting extended family relationships, slaves continued to abide by some of the African marriage rules. For example, in West-Central African societies first-cousin marriage was forbidden, and most slaves adhered to this prohibition (Huggins 1977:163; Mintz and Kellogg 1988:68; Malone 1992:239-240). The common practice of brideprice payments at marriage was almost impossible to reproduce under slavery given that fact that most slaves owned little personal wealth. Yet there is evidence of slave

marriages that treated matrimony like a social contract instead of a religious bond typical of Anglo-American marriage ceremonies, and forms of bride price may have passed between hands, more symbolic than real (see Piersen 1996:90-91). Polygamy under slavery was unachievable for most, again because it was based on wealth, wives functioning as a form and symbol of assets. Still, there are rare examples of men with more than one wife, and one example of an enslaved man living near Utopia who committed suicide in 1712 because he was not allowed to keep multiple wives (Piersen 1996:92; see also Kulikoff 1977a:173, 1986:354; Gutman 1976:331; Morgan 1998:554; Walsh 1997:86).

A substantial percentage of slaves married spouses living on nearby plantations. The practice was so widespread that unions between slave men and women living on different plantations became known as "abroad" or "broad" marriages (see Morgan 1998:508). Abroad marriages became a distinctive feature of Chesapeake slave families, in part explaining the apparent prevalence of single-parent residential arrangements, usually mothers and children residing together with a father living elsewhere. These "divided residence families" defied conventional connubial terminology, and became a structural feature unique to Chesapeake slave families (see Morgan 1998:508-509).

Although it is possible to construe the sometimes high percentage of abroad marriages as impeding family stability, they also can be interpreted as an active form of exogamy. In some ways then, slaves may have reproduced the exogamous character of West-Central African society by forming conjugal unions with mates outside their own plantation, perhaps considering that the slaves they cohabitated with on a plantation as an extended

⁴ There are examples of slave marriages or double marriages in common use at nearby Carter's Grove plantation (Walsh 1997:165-170).

family, both fictive and consanguineal (see Gutman 1976:131-138; Sudarkasa 1980:56; 1988:37; Boles 1983:35; Morgan 1998:554).

Researchers have identified what they believe to be additional slave practices that demonstrate the retention of family customs from West-Central Africa. For instance, the ways in which many slaves named children after the father implies a continuance of naming customs from the homeland (Sudarkasa 1980:57; see also Gutman 1975; Boles 1983:42-43; Piersen 1996:91; Morgan 1998:546-547). Boles also suggests that from the early 18th-century slaves may have retained a system of surnames (usually unacknowledged by an owner); the surnames usually referenced a specific place or owner, and by doing this slaves were able to retain a connection with an "ancestral homeplace," a practice derived from Africa (1983:43).⁴

West-Central African birthing patterns and attitudes about reproduction also seem to have been preserved in some manner under slavery. Compared to European standards, relative sexual freedom was accepted in some African societies and this attitude was evident among slaves in America. Premarital sex was common and a young woman might give birth to her first child out of wedlock before eventually settling down with a husband (see Huggins 1977:166-167; Piersen 1996:91). In a polygynous marriage system the responsibility for bearing a family's children was distributed among more than one wife. Because of this, the average African mother breast fed her child for a longer period than Anglo-American mothers, lengthening the interval between births to three or four years (Gutman 1976:331; see also Boles 1983:33-34; Stevenson 1996:246-249;

⁴ There are examples of slave surnames or double names in common use at nearby Carter's Grove plantation (Walsh 1997:165-170).

Morgan 1998:87-92). Slave birth patterns suggest that the earlier generations of African slaves were able to maintain these traditional patterns of postpartum sexual abstinence and weaning (Piersen 1996:93). However, over time the pressure for slave women to have more children is evident in the accelerated birth rate seen in the latter 18th and 19th century (Stevenson 1996:246-249).

Gender Roles

While kinship rules structure the family, gender roles play a determining part in how families function. Like kinship, gender roles and family organization are similar in many parts of West and Central Africa (Patterson 1998:25). In African societies men and women assume gender roles quite different from their European and Anglo-American counterparts, and have done so for many centuries. Whereas Anglo-American women and men labored in distinctly separate spheres, women primarily in the domestic realm and men outside of it (Brown 1996:24-25), in some African societies the division between women's and men's jobs was blurred (see Billingsley 1992:94). For example, it was not uncommon for both sexes to tend crops and participate in farm labor. And yet there is a distinct social separation between African men and women that goes beyond simply a division of labor.

In most West-Central African cultures fathers have little to do with childrearing, leaving mothers to handle most of it and seek assistance from other women, resulting in the formation of strong female kin networks. In polygynous societies co-wives band together to raise their children and perform domestic tasks, forming cooperative households in the process. Women and men sleep in separate rooms and sometimes in gender segregated houses, and rarely socialize between the sexes. All of these factors

reinforce the fact that West and Central African men and women spend a majority of their time apart from each other and little has changed in that regard over the past 400 years (Casey 1991:142; Mullin 1992:172; Mintz and Price 1992:80).

Within the West-Central African conjugal unit, men and women had, and continue to maintain, "distinct purviews" with women exerting "a good deal of control over the fruits of their own labor" (Sudarkasa 1987:32-33). Wives played a key economic role in the family, sharing agricultural labor, if not at times shouldering the primary responsibility for crop cultivation, while at the same time overseeing the domestic realm (hooks 1981:17; Nash 1982:182; Sobel 1987:28; Fage 1989:154-155; Walsh 1994:53; Patterson 1998:26; Piersen 1996:92).

The nature of West-Central African kinship places an emphasis on the role of motherhood and the centrality of children, a fact that reinforces the concept that marriage is, and was, first and foremost a social contract intended to benefit the growth of the extended family (White 1985:66; Callaway 1993; Staples and Johnson 1993:2; Hill 1999:53). As such, a woman's status within her family, and within the wider society, may be established in part by how many children she produces. Some researchers have misread the importance of motherhood to mean that African women hold power and authority over men, at least within the household. The role of women and motherhood in Africa has also misled some to characterize African society as matriarchal or *woman-headed*, whereas most African households are matrifocal, or *woman-centered* with men making the majority of the decisions (Sudarkasa 1980:44; *ibid.* 1988:36; Billingsley 1992:116; Hill 1999:51).

Since gender roles were more loosely defined than kinship rules, Africans enslaved in the New World had greater opportunity to recreate gender norms under slavery, at least in appearance, if not in function. Gender roles were more private, whereas kinship rules were formal dicta by which members of African societies had to follow closely or risk public condemnation or expulsion. In their native societies a husband and wife might determine between themselves just how egalitarian their relationship might be structured, taking into account the cultural and societal imperatives under which they operated. Under slavery at places like the Utopia Quarter gender norms were outside the interest or concern of most slave owners. Behind the closed doors of their cabins, men and women were more or less free to determine what types of roles to assume. It would be comforting to believe that slavery caused men and women to join together as equal partners for the betterment of their households, as some researchers have suggested (see Davis 1971, 1981; White 1985:158; 1991:121; J. Jones 1989:197; Robertson 1996:15). In reality, however, enslavement produced a level of instability for all marriages that made it difficult to trust, accept, or fully commit to one another. How each conjugal pair organized their family, whether they resided together or apart, and what roles each spouse assumed within the household depended upon larger demographic patterns that were usually outside their direct control.

Demographic Factors Shaping Household and Family at Utopia

The majority of slave scholarship concentrates on the 19th century, an era that post-dates activity at the Utopia Quarter by at least a generation (see Blassingame 1972; Genovese 1974; J. Jones 1985; White 1985; Fox-Genovese 1989; Malone 1992), although a set of important works discuss the 18th-century Chesapeake slave family in

some detail (see Kulikoff 1977a; 1978; 1986:352-380; Norton et al. 1983; Stevenson 1996a; Walsh 1997; Berlin 1998:129-133; Morgan 1998:498-552). To reach their conclusions, historians of African-American slave families have mined resources such as probates, estate inventories, wills, tax lists, censuses, and in a few instances, plantation record books to reconstruct slave family structure (Lee 1986:337; Walsh 1997; Morgan 1998:498-499). Like most research tools, these written and tabular sources of information have their drawbacks and biases, and most do not address slave families explicitly (Malone 1992:237). For example, most inventories do not list slaves by family, but rather by age, value, or gender (see Malone 1992; Walsh 1997). Yet, by employing some innovative techniques and creatively interpreting the documents at hand, historians have been able to reach new levels of detail regarding slave social organization.

Stages of Slave Family Development

Most contemporary historians agree that over the course of the 18th century the opportunity for slaves to live with family members in the same housing unit improved. Family life was difficult to establish in the early 18th century, but by mid-century perhaps half the slaves in the Chesapeake "knew of some form of family life" (Morgan 1998:503). While abroad marriages continued to flourish into the 19th century, the gradual improvement of the propinquity of family members was contingent upon many external factors, most of which were controlled by slave owners. Several recent historians of Chesapeake slavery have outlined the process of culture change and family growth as a series of stages, stages that can be compared to the four occupation periods at Utopia (Kulikoff 1986; Berlin 1998; Morgan 1998).

² Following Ira Berlin's lead, the term *crack-whites* applied to groups of slaves who in American-born slaves of African descent (Berlin 1988:436).

In the mid-1980s Alan Kulikoff (1986) published one of the most comprehensive histories of the 18th-century Chesapeake. Based mainly on demographic data and documentary sources, Kulikoff segmented the growth of what he called African-American "community development" into three stages (1986:319). He suggests that from roughly 1650 to 1690 family growth was limited due to the relatively low number of slaves in the region, small, widely dispersed plantations, and a grossly imbalanced sex ratio (*ibid.*:319-334, 353-358). These conditions created "a demographic environment hostile to most forms of family life" (*ibid.*:355). From 1690 to 1740 the importation of enslaved Africans increased dramatically causing social conflict between creole⁵ slaves and new arrivals, disrupting but not preventing the formation of stable slave communities and families (*ibid.*:335-345, 358-371). Eventually, in the third period from 1740 to 1790 imports declined and demographic imbalances stabilized to allow for community and family development and a distinctive African-American culture to materialize (*ibid.*:345-351, 371-380) (Table 3.1).

Little more than a decade after Kulikoff, Ira Berlin (1998) and Philip D. Morgan (1998) published two of the most comprehensive studies of 17th- and 18th-century African-American history in recent memory. Berlin examined the four main slaving regions in North America—the Chesapeake, the Lowcountry, the Mississippi Valley, and the North—finding that although the transformation from Africans to African Americans was "an uneven, convoluted process," it unfolded "in three distinctive experiences" (1998:12). Without assigning fixed time brackets, Berlin defines a "charter generation"

⁵ Following Ira Berlin's lead, the term *creole* when applied to groups of slaves refers to American-born slaves of African descent (Berlin 1980:45n2).

Table 3.1. The growth of 17th- and 18th-century Chesapeake slave families as charted by recent historians.

	Kulikoff 1986	Berlin 1998	Morgan 1998
Early	Small percentage of slaves, high sex ratio, small plantation size, minimal family growth, 1650-1690	Charter generations-first arrivals and their children, small numbers of stable families form, 1619-1676	Frontier phase, slave family formation tenuous, 1619-1690
Middle	Heavy imports, social conflict between natives and newcomers, steady family growth, 1690-1740	Plantation generations-gradual family expansion, vast kinship networks develop, family is locus of opposition to planter control 1676-1776	Institution building phase, demographic situation improves family formation possibilities, 1690-1720
Late	Imports decline, formation of settled communities, majority of slaves live in families 1740-1790	Revolutionary generations-seeds of freedom sown, but many families disrupted 1776-1865	Mature phase, most common form of slave household is single-parent, 1720-1790

in the 17th century, followed by a "plantation generation" in the 18th century, and lastly a "revolutionary generation" in the years after the American Revolution (*ibid.*). Berlin's principle focus is on "the struggle over labor" between master and slave, meaning his three broad generations presage emancipation in 1865 rather than chart the growth of slave families (*ibid.*:11). However, in general Berlin sees some amount of stability in slave family formation on a limited scale during the charter generation (*ibid.*:40-41), followed by gradual expansion of the institution in the plantation generation (*ibid.*:129-131), and then a precarious period of disruption and breakdown due to outside forces during the revolutionary generation (*ibid.*:266, 271) (see Table 3.1).

Philip Morgan is more interested in comparing and contrasting just two slaving regions, the Chesapeake and the Lowcountry (coastal South Carolina) in the 18th century. Almost as an aside he offers a cultural growth sequence in the Chesapeake similar to Kulikoff (Morgan 1998:xviii) (see Table 3.1). Like Berlin, Morgan is not particularly

concerned with subdividing African-American history into fixed time periods, but prefers to take “synchronic snapshots” of the two slave societies and discuss them in exhaustive detail (ibid.:xix). Nevertheless, Morgan suggests in general terms that slave family formation in the Chesapeake was “tenuous” in the first stage, improved in the second stage due to demographic shifts, and by the third stage single-parent households were the most common form in the region (ibid.:503).

All three historians tend to agree the three stages of family formation in the Chesapeake followed a similar path. Kulikoff and Morgan suggest only limited opportunities for slave families developed in the 17th century, whereas Berlin’s charter generation slaves found ways to modestly prosper in the years before harsh slave codes were passed (1998:40-41). Morgan and Kulikoff devote entire chapters of their books to slave family development, whereas Berlin discusses the topic in less detail. However, Brenda Stevenson (1996) closely examines the issue of slave families in her study of family and community development in Loudoun County, Virginia (1996). All three historians seem to agree that the first half of the 18th century was a time of extraordinary change and the possibilities for family growth improved in relation to three key determinants: the gradual parity of the slave sex ratio; changes in the size, complexity, and population density of plantations; and a decline in transatlantic slave trade as the slave birth rate improved (Kulikoff 1986:352-380; Stevenson 1996:207-210; Morgan 1998:498-558).

Activity at the Utopia Quarter site corresponds with the three general stages of culture change and family development as summarized by Kulikoff (1986), Berlin (1998), and Morgan (1998) (Figure 3.1; see Table 3.1). As illustrated in Figure 3.1, the

initial occupation of Utopia took place from ca. 1675 to 1700 and generally corresponds with the Early Period of slave settlement in the Chesapeake. Berlin's charter generation of slaves ends with Bacon's Rebellion in 1676, but both Kulikoff and Morgan assign 1690 as a transition date between the Early and Middle periods (see Figure 3.1). As it happens, the year 1690 is when Utopia's first owner Thomas Pettus II died and the property may have stood vacant for a decade after that, meaning Period 1 at Utopia was most active for 15 years between ca. 1675 and 1690. If so, then Period 1 fits into the Early Period of the Kulikoff and Morgan models (see Figure 3.1).

Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries Chesapeake planters preferred male slaves, believing more labor could be extracted from them. From the beginning of the slave trade imports of men outnumbered women on a scale of two and three to one, making for a high sex ratio for Chesapeake slaves (Kulikoff 1986:66-67, 321; Morgan 1998:71, 80-83). On most late 17th- and early 18th-century plantations "men so outnumbered women that marriages were out the question for the majority" (Morgan 1998:502; see also Kulikoff 1986:355). Such was the likely case for the first generation of slaves living at Utopia. To make matters worse, the population density of slaves was low; in most areas slaves made up less than ten percent of the local populace (Berlin 1998:369). Locally, English indentured servants outnumbered African slaves two to one in the 1670s, but by 1690 servants had "all but disappeared" (Menard 1977:362).

Plantation size remained small, with most African slaves living in groups of ten or less, which was probably the case at Utopia (Kulikoff 1986:331). Given these demographic factors, the slaves living at the Utopia Quarter in the 1670s, 1680s, and 1690s had only the 1710s, 1720s, and 1730s" (1986:334). Thus, the conditions for family development

limited opportunities to form families, and for those couples fortunate enough to reside together with their children, the stability of those arrangements was in constant jeopardy.

The second occupation period at Utopia (1700 to ca. 1730) corresponds with the Middle Period of slave settlement as designated by Kulikoff, Morgan, and Berlin (see Figure 3.1). In most places the sex ratio remained uneven during this period, although the gap between men and women was gradually closing. Still, because of a shortage of potential marriage partners, many slave men by necessity went in search of wives outside their home plantations and formed abroad marriages. On average, plantation size grew throughout the course of the 18th century and this facilitated coresidential unions among slaves (Morgan 1998:507). By the first decade of the 18th century the majority of Chesapeake slaves lived on plantations with more than 11 slaves, as was probably the case at Utopia (ibid.:41). This was due in part to the slave trade, but more so to the ability of resident Chesapeake slaves to sustain an annual natural increase birth rate of approximately one percent by 1720 (ibid.:81).

In the first two decades of the 18th century the slave trade introduced several thousand new Africans to the Chesapeake per year. By 1710 the ratio of imported to native-born slaves was virtually even (Morgan 1998:61). The influx of new Africans eventually helped stabilize the uneven sex ratio, but it also caused dissonance between the newcomers and the existing population of creole slaves (Kulikoff 1986:333-334). Internal disharmony arose in many places between the groups, sometimes delaying rather than hastening the development of families. Kulikoff notes, "Slaves in the Chesapeake colonies failed to establish a settled community life in the times of heavy immigration in the 1710s, 1720s, and 1730s" (1986:334). Thus, the conditions for family development

during the second period of occupation at Utopia (1700 to ca. 1730) were volatile and changing. Some of Utopia's slaves may have been able to reside together with a spouse and children, whereas others never got the opportunity to do so.

Period 3 at Utopia (ca. 1730 to ca. 1750) corresponds with both the Middle and Late periods as constructed by our three historians (Berlin's Middle, Morgan's Late, and straddles Kulikoff's Middle and Late) (see Figure 3.1). Throughout the second quarter of the 18th century, as the slave trade gradually declined, and as the birth rate increased to between 3 to 5 percent annual growth, the sex ratio moved closer to parity (Morgan 1998:61). However, slaves continued to look outside the confines of their plantations for mates, in some cases due to the fact that enough time had elapsed to allow for communities of interrelated slaves to develop (Kulikoff 1986:374). For a child the comfort of growing up among kin while young could change to frustration as an adult; if the majority of a plantation's slaves were related by blood, rules of exogamy forced slaves in search of spouses to go abroad (Patterson 1998:33-34). The choice of mates living outside the immediate boundaries of one's plantation was on the rise; the overall slave population steadily increased from roughly 30 percent of the total population in 1720 to nearly 50 percent by 1750 (Berlin 1998:369). The majority of slaves in the region around Utopia lived in units numbering more than 11 people, and many of these units were knit together by kin networks, as was the case at Utopia (Morgan 1998:41). At the same time the percentage of Africans was on the decline, down to around 34 percent in 1740, and decreasing rapidly to 21 percent by 1750 (Morgan 1998:61). With fewer strangers being introduced into the general population, the stability of communities and kin networks improved. Overall, family growth and the potential for a husband,

wife, and children to live under the same roof continued to grow, and Utopia was no exception.

Period 4 at Utopia (ca. 1750 to ca. 1775) is consistent with the Late Period for Kulikoff and Morgan, and continues to fall within the Middle Period for Berlin.⁶ By the 1750s the ratio of Chesapeake slave men to women almost reached parity (Kulikoff 1986:359; Morgan 1998:502). However, abroad marriages continued to predominate, prompting Morgan to conclude that the most common household form for Chesapeake slaves in the second half of the 18th century was the single-parent family, or what might more appropriately be termed "divided residence families," as a way to signal that many spouses maintained an active relationship although residing separately (1998:503, 509).

As kinship networks continued to grow, cross-plantation connections became more complex, and slaves expanded the boundaries of their social world. At the same time, in some areas the rate of slave population growth increased enough that slaves outnumbered Anglo-Americans. For example, by the mid-18th century in James City County slaves achieved a majority of the local population and increased those numbers to more than 60 percent in the 1780s (Morgan 1998:98-99; see also Kulikoff 1986:340). By force of numbers slaves were able to create an almost insular world in which on a daily basis many slaves would have contact only with fellow slaves. This was facilitated by the steady increase in the size of the average slave quarter or plantation. By the 1760s two out of every three slaves lived on farms or quarters of more than ten slaves, and close to one-third of the slave population resided on plantations of more than 20 slaves

⁶ Because Berlin does not differentiate within the century-long plantation generation, all four occupation periods at Utopia correspond with it, almost down to the year (see Figure 3-1).

(Morgan 1998:41). With the slave trade slowing to a trickle compared to its heyday in the early 18th century, population growth was due almost entirely to natural increase. By 1760 the numbers of African-born slaves in the Chesapeake fell below 15 percent, and a decade later it was below ten percent, effectively limiting the direct connections slaves felt with African cultures, but also lessening the potential clashes between New World and Old (Morgan 1998:61). Of the four occupation episodes at Utopia, this final one that occurred between ca. 1750 and ca. 1775 took place within the most agreeable demographic setting for forming family bonds.

While acknowledging that stability is a relative term, and no family living under slavery could experience total security, Kulikoff, Berlin, Morgan, and Stevenson all suggest that some degree of family stability was achieved for slaves in the second half of the 18th century, in comparison to the first half of the century.⁷ The climate for slave family formation improved dramatically over the lifespan of the Utopia Quarter. The first slaves that lived at Utopia in the 1670s and 1680s had few prospects for finding spouses, producing children, or reaching old age with family members by their side. One hundred years later a typical slave living at Utopia had every reason to believe that a spouse, children, and a supportive network of kin were within grasp. Still, the dominant slave residence pattern that developed in the Chesapeake was a mother and children living under one roof with a father residing elsewhere (Kulikoff 1986:370-372; Stevenson 1996:160-161; Morgan 1998:508-509). This type of living arrangement was not extremely different in structure from what was found in many West and Central

⁷ Since Berlin's study extends beyond the 18th century, he outlines a post-Revolutionary period of renewed instability for slave families; however, this is outside the scope of this study (1998).

African societies with husbands and wives sleeping in separate areas. Indeed, the available evidence indicates that the two-parent simple family household was not the ideal residential model for most slaves (Stevenson 1996:160). Instead, a “malleable extended family” that could provide “its members with nurture, education, socialization, material support, and recreation in the face of the potential social chaos that the slaveholder imposed” was what most slaves hoped to construct (ibid.).

Historical Slave Household Case Studies

More than a quarter of a century ago, Herbert Gutman scolded his colleagues for marshalling evidence on slave residency patterns that was “largely descriptive and not analytic” (1975:186; see also Davis 1997; Dodson 1988:78-79; Peters 1988:231-232; Schweninger 1975:29-30). Since that time, a generation of historians have published enough quantifiable data to provide a baseline of housing unit membership trends in the 18th-century Chesapeake (see Kulikoff 1977a; 1986:352-380; Norton et al. 1983; Stevenson 1996a; 1996b; Walsh 1997; Morgan 1998:498-552). Information on the composition of housing units and family groupings has been compiled for 3,727 slaves in the Chesapeake between 1733 and 1799 (Table 3.2).

It is worth noting that all of the historians who have contributed to the residency studies outlined in Table 3.2 use the term *household* unreflectively and make no distinction between households and coresident groups as I have discussed in the previous chapter. While the various types of residency groups are significant, my interest is in the difference between households (group cooperating) and coresident groups (unallied individuals). I assume that family members living under one roof cooperated and constituted households, whereas unrelated people did not and formed coresident groups.

Table 3.2. Housing unit composition for selected Chesapeake plantations.

Housing Unit Composition	Carter 1733 ^a	7 Small estates, 1744-1775 ^b	6 Large estates, 1740-1788 ^b	3 Large estates 1759-1775 ^c	Carroll 1773 ^d	Small estates Prince Geo's Maryland 1776 ^e	Washington 1799 ^e	Average of all estates
Couples, no children	8%	6%	6%	1%	4%		7%	5.3
Two parent w/children	40	6	45	47	60	18	8	32
One parent w/children	(21)	59	19	(26)	(37)	(34)	(9)	29.3
Mother w/children	17			23	32	32	9	22.6
Father w/children	4			3	5	2		3.5
Siblings			2	7		8	1	4.5
Extended family	1		9	4				4.6
Solitaires [#]		<u>29</u>	<u>20</u>				<u>32</u>	27
Adolescents/children							4	
Abroad couple							15	
One parent w/children, spouse abroad							24	
Mixed						41		
No family present [#]	<u>30</u>			<u>15</u>	<u>(14)</u>			
Totals	100	100	101	100	101	101	100	

[#] Categorized as a coresident group.

* Note this same group is included in the three large Maryland estates occupied between 1759-1775. Details were not available to factor out the 385 Carroll slaves from the three large estates, but the Carroll slaves were not counted twice in the final totals.

^a In 1733 Robert "King" Carter owned 733 slaves dispersed on 48 quarters into 221 coresident groups throughout the Chesapeake (Kulikoff 1986:358)

^b The data for the seven small plantations includes holdings in Essex, Loudoun, and York counties occupied between 1744 and 1775 and totaling 63 slaves (Morgan 1998:504).

The data for the six large Chesapeake plantations includes ones occupied between 1740 and 1788 and totaling 1,051 slaves (Morgan 1998:505).

^c The data set includes three large plantations belonging to James Wardrop (1759), Thomas Addison (1775) and Charles Carroll (1773-1774), all of Prince George's County, Maryland, and totaling 526 slaves (Kulikoff 1977a:179).

Small plantations containing eight or less slaves were compiled from a 1776 Prince George's County, Maryland, census and totaled 1038 slaves (Kulikoff 1977a:180).

^d In 1773 Charles Carroll owned 385 slaves dispersed on 13 quarters in Anne Arundel County, Maryland (Norton et al. 1983:178). The published figures do not account for 14 percent of the Carroll slaves not living in immediate families. The percentages in Table 3.2 are for residency types, not individual slaves.

^e In 1799 George Washington owned 316 slaves dispersed across five farms, including the home plantation at Mount Vernon, and divided into 135 housing units (Stevenson 1996a:211). The percentages in Table 3.2 are based on housing units, not individual slaves.

^f In all of the above cases, the researcher quantified the housing units slightly differently, but in general they each derived similar results (see Table 3.3).

Therefore, in Table 3.2 housing units comprised of solitaires or with no family members present are considered coresident groups. All others are categorized as households.

The earliest comprehensive slave residency and family data pertain to wealthy planter Robert "King" Carter. When Carter died in 1732, he owned 734 slaves, more than any other Chesapeake planter of his era (Kulikoff 1986:356). The 734 slaves were dispersed on 48 quarters, and divided into 221 housing units. An average of 15 slaves lived at each of Carter's quarters (Table 3.3).⁸ Approximately 70 to 75 percent of the Carter slaves lived in households (with family members present), whereas between 25 and 30 percent lived in coresident groups (see Tables 3.2 and 3.3). A notably higher percentage of coresident groups lived on Carter's smaller quarters (40 percent) compared to larger ones (26 percent). The differences may have been due to a shortage of women on the smaller quarters where women were outnumbered by men almost two to one, compared to the larger quarters with sex ratios closer to parity (Morgan 1998:504). Or many of the men on Carter's smaller quarters may have been recently arrived Africans, perhaps explaining why 57 percent of them lived alone or with unrelated men (Morgan 1998:503).

Slave residency data are available for six large Virginia estates occupied between 1740 and 1788 (see Table 3.2). Of the 1,051 slaves in the sample, 20 percent lived in coresident groups compared to the 80 percent in households (see Table 3.2). For comparison, on seven small Virginia estates occupied at the same time the numbers

⁸ In addition to Kulikoff, Lorena Walsh, and Philip D. Morgan have systematically examined the Carter slave inventory for evidence of how slaves were housed (see Table 3.3). Morgan also divided Carter's slaves into large quarters (≥ 16 people) and small quarters (≤ 15 people) for comparison (see Table 3.3). Each researcher quantified the housing units slightly differently, but in general they each derived similar results (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3. Housing unit composition for Robert Carter's slaves, 1733.

Housing Unit Composition	Carter 1733 (699 slaves) Walsh	Carter 1733 (733 slaves) Kulikoff	Carter 1733 (733 slaves) Morgan	Carter 1733 ≤15	Carter 1733 ≥16
Couples, no children	8	8	8	9	7
Two parent w/children	41	40	41	41	41
One parent w/children	(24)	(21)	19	6	25
Mother w/children	18	17			
Father w/children	6	4			
Siblings					
Extended family	5	1	2	3	1
Solitaires [#]			<u>30</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>26</u>
Adolescents/children					
Abroad couple					
One parent w/children, spouse abroad					
Mixed					
No family present [#]	<u>23</u>	<u>30</u>			
Totals	101	100	100	99	100

[#] Categorized as a coresident group.

indicate that 29 percent of the residency groups were coresident, whereas 71 percent were households (see Table 3.2). The differences between the large and the small plantations here support the trend found in the Carter data: coresident groups were more likely to be found on smaller slave quarters, and the climate for households was better at larger quarters (see Table 3.2).

Fully 85 percent of the residency groups on three large Maryland plantations occupied between 1759 and 1775 were households, and only 15 percent categorized as coresident groups (see Table 3.2). A survey of a group of more than 1,000 slaves living on small plantations (≤ eight people) in Prince George's County, Maryland, in 1776 is more difficult to decipher. Approximately 41 percent of the slaves lived in "mixed" residence groups, some of which may have functioned as households (see Table 3.2).

However, it is interesting to note that if all the "mixed" residence groups on these small quarters were coresident, that percentage is nearly identical to the 40 percent of coresidences on King Carter's small quarters in 1733 (cf., Tables 3.2 and 3.3).

Profiles of slave residency patterns for the late 18th century come from two of the Chesapeake's wealthiest planters, Charles Carroll of Annapolis, Maryland, and George Washington of Mount Vernon, Virginia (see Table 3.2). Carroll owned 385 slaves in 1773 that formed 79 discrete residency units. At least 14 percent of the Carroll slaves did not live in immediate families, suggesting that they resided in coresident groups (Norton et al. 1983:179).

In 1799 George Washington owned 316 slaves spread across five farms, including those living at his Mount Vernon plantation. The 316 slaves formed 135 residency units. Nearly one-third of Washington's slaves lived in coresident groups (see Table 3.2). For the 96 slaves living at Mount Vernon, roughly 25 percent of them were single men and women, presumably housed together in what would have constituted coresident groups (Stevenson 1996a:210). At Washington's outlying farms between approximately 20 and 40 percent of the residency groups were comprised of single adults (ibid.; 1996b:178).

Although occurring in the 19th century, inventories of the households of slaves belonging to the William Fitzhugh family in 1801 and 1830 offer a perspective of how slave residence patterns changed in response to contracting plantation size. In 1801 planter William Fitzhugh owned 224 slaves distributed across four farms in Loudoun and Fairfax counties, Virginia. Some 70 percent of the slaves lived in apparent households, and the remaining 30 percent in coresident groups. Of that 30 percent, 69 percent of those were men (Stevenson 1996a:212). An inventory was taken of these same Fitzhugh

slaves 29 years later in 1830. This time the slave population had been reduced to only 83 people. Some 54 percent of the remaining slaves lived in "family groups," meaning as many as 38 of the Fitzhugh slaves may have resided in coresidences (Stevenson 1996a:212-213). Ann Malone studied the family structure of more than 19,000 Louisiana slaves between 1810 and 1864 and found, in contrast to the Fitzhugh data, that 82 percent lived in households, whereas 18 percent lived as solitaires, presumably in coresident groups (Malone 1992).

Two significant findings emerge from the slave residency data. First, generally speaking, between the 1730s to the 1790s, roughly 30 percent of Chesapeake slaves lived in coresident groups, and 70 percent lived in households (see Table 3.2). Second, slaves living on larger plantations had more opportunity to form households than those slaves living on smaller plantations or quarters (see Kulikoff 1986:371; Morgan 1998:507-511). Because the conditions at each plantation varied so widely, generalizations about Chesapeake slave residential patterns must be provisional. Each plantation or complex of quarters had its own lifecycle and the forces that facilitated family formation and growth could differ considerably. For example, in a comparison of the slave residency profiles of Robert Carter's slaves in 1733 and George Washington's in 1799, one would expect to see an increase in households at Mount Vernon. And yet the percentage of households for both Carter and Washington was nearly the same at 70 percent (see Table 3.2).

There is no available documentation pertaining to the Utopia Quarter that will permit quantification of the households and coresident groups. Whether or not the 70 percent threshold for households was met at Utopia will remain unknown. However, a background history of Utopia in the next chapter will help make sense of some of the

general residency patterns at the site, and these in turn will be further investigated with several forms of archaeological evidence in the chapters to follow.

Figure 3.1. Graph of historical eras of development in relation to Utopia occupation periods.

Figure 3.1. Graph of historical eras of development in relation to Utopia occupation periods.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE UTOPIA QUARTER

Purchase what likely Negroes you can, either 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. What boys & men you possibly can, as few women as may be, but be sure not above two, to purchase neither men nor women above thirty years old, not to exceed £20 for the price of a man, unless he be extraordinary likely.

Planter William Fitzhugh (1681 [1963]:119),
instructions for buying slaves

When servants and slaves belonging to Thomas Pettus II¹ began living at the Utopia Quarter in the mid 1670s the colony was embroiled in a tense decade of civil unrest that became known as Bacon's Rebellion. The turmoil came to a head in 1676 when hundreds of dispossessed servants, slaves, tenants, freedmen, and small farmers joined in an armed revolt against the ruling planter elites. For several months the rebels roamed about the countryside and appeared to have the upper hand, even capturing the capitol at Jamestown for a short time (Washburn 1957; Webb 1984). However, while many of the key events during the rebellion occurred in their neighborhood, and the servants and slaves at Utopia would have been likely recruits, there is no evidence that any of the site's residents joined the rebel forces. Regardless, the rebellion would have been an important event in their lives, a source of conversation, speculation, concern, and excitement, whether or not they actively participated.

Bacon's Rebellion failed to unseat the standing government, and ultimately represented the triumph of an elite planter class to maintain control of power. As a means to prevent another rebellion, the victorious planters subsequently instituted a harsh slave code that codified a system of racially-based slavery that prevailed for the next 175

¹ The owners of Utopia—the Pettuses, the Brays, and the Burwells—each had multiple family members with the same name, in some cases six or seven generations. To distinguish between them, I have assigned roman numerals to each of the main figures attached to the site, beginning with the eldest forbearer as "I". Also to prevent redundancy and confusion among the Brays and Burwells I sometimes refer to them by their first names, as in "James II" for James Bray II or "Lewis IV" for Lewis Burwell IV.

years (Morgan 1975:328-329; Berlin 1998:45, 109). Fittingly, almost a century after Bacon's Rebellion the Utopia Quarter was abandoned during a second moment of dramatic political upheaval. This time a large sector of the colonial population, including many of the ruling elites, rebelled against British control and fought a war for independence. The owner of Utopia at the time, Lewis Burwell IV chose to relocate to central Virginia in 1775, largely to avoid the conflict that was brewing and potentially threatening his land and property, including his sizeable slave population.

In the century of time between Bacon's Rebellion and the American Revolution, four different groups of people lived at the Utopia Quarter site (see Table 1.1). The initial inhabitants consisted of a mixture of enslaved Africans and English indentured servants who occupied the site between ca. 1675-1700 while planter Thomas Pettus II owned it. In the year 1700 James Bray II acquired the property and housed a portion of his growing population of field slaves at the site. Later in the 1730s and early 1740s Bray's son Thomas Bray II and grandson James Bray III billeted slaves at Utopia. Eventually, after marrying James Bray III's widow, Lewis Burwell IV maintained a group of his slaves at the site beginning in 1745 until he moved west in 1775 (see Table 1.1). Not long after that the site was abandoned.

Collectively, the four groups of people who at various times called the Utopia Quarter home left nearly 100,000 artifacts for archaeologists to find. While this is an ample archaeological record from which to interpret their lives, the slaves living at Utopia left no surviving documents about themselves. On the other hand, the owners of

¹ For examples of management styles throughout the 18th century, see the diaries of William Byrd (Wright and Tilling 1941, 1938; Woodfin and Tilling 1942), Landon Carter (Greene 1965), Robert Carter (Morton 1964; Carter Family Papers), Robert "King" Carter (Carter Family Papers), and Carter Burwell (Burwell 1961), and the letters of Joseph Bell (Bell Letterbook).

Utopia all left some sort of a paper trail.² These circumstances produce one of the bitter ironies of historical research of American slavery: study of the slave master is usually the most direct documentary means to interpret the lives of the people he owned. Therefore, the documentary history of Utopia must be extrapolated almost entirely from the five principal owners of the property: Pettus, the Brays, and Burwell. No matter how inequitable this approach may be, it is possible to gain a better understanding of what life might have been like at Utopia by examining the motivations, mindset, and lifecycle of its owners (Walsh 1997:xx). The ability of slaves to form families and households was contingent in large part on the consent of each owner (Morgan 1998:499-501). Over the course of the 18th century, the majority of Virginia's larger planters increasingly recognized the validity of slave marriages and families (ibid.:513-514). By the latter decades of the 18th century many planters allowed and even encouraged their slaves to marry, seeing this as a benign method of control that reduced incidents of running away, improved the general emotional welfare of their slaves, and created a more docile and productive slave population (ibid.:530-540; see also Berlin 1980:74; 1998:129-130). Management styles varied widely, from planters who favored the stick, to those who preferred to use the carrot; families became the primary carrot offered by planters (Berlin 1998:97-100).³

The remainder of this chapter provides historical synopses of the four Utopia occupation periods. The background histories focus on the five principal owners, and

² The Utopia site is located in James City County, one of the "burned over" counties for which most of the historical documents up to 1865 were destroyed during the Civil War.

³ For examples of management styles throughout the 18th century, see the diaries of William Byrd (Wright and Tinling 1941, 1958; Woodfin and Tinling 1942), Landon Carter (Greene 1965), Robert Carter (Morton 1964; Carter Family Papers), Robert "King" Carter (Carter Family Papers), and Carter Burwell (Burwell 1961), and the letters of Joseph Ball (Ball Letterbook).

most of the information concerning the social milieu of the enslaved residents living at Utopia is extrapolated from a small number of crucial primary documents. These include a 1691 probate inventory of Thomas Pettus II's estate; a 1725/26 probate inventory of James Bray II's holdings; a farm ledger kept by James Bray III between 1736 and 1744; a list of slaves that James III's wife received after his death in 1745; and tax lists of Lewis Burwell IV's slaves in 1768, 1769, 1782, and 1783. None of the documents refer to slave households or families directly, but they serve as sources of inferential evidence from which the conditions for household and family can be deduced.

History of Period 1 Utopia, ca. 1675-1700

When Thomas Pettus I died in the early 1660s, he left to his youngest son and namesake a 1,280-acre tobacco plantation located on the James River known as the Littletown and Utopia tracts (Figure 4.1).⁴ When Thomas Pettus II turned 21 in the mid-1670s he gained control of his inheritance. Occupying the plantation house built by his father at Littletown, one of Pettus II's first directives was to build a field quarter at the nearby Utopia tract to house some of his indentured servants and African slaves (Fesler 2000:25). The new quarter was to be located about a mile to the east of Pettus's manor house, close enough to be accessible for him to manage, but far enough not to interfere with activity at Littletown (see Figures 1.2 and 4.1).

Thomas Pettus II took over management of Littletown/Utopia during a period of political, social, and economic disarray. The Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660 drove up the cost of transporting tobacco to market by requiring planters to ship their tobacco exclusively with British traders. Moreover, in the 1660s a glut of tobacco pushed prices

⁴ Henceforth, the combined plantation of Littletown and Utopia will be referenced as Littletown/Utopia in the text.

to staggering new lows and a war with the Dutch in the mid-1660s and again in the early 1670s further hampered Virginia planters from getting their product safely to consumers in England. Add to that the turmoil associated with Bacon's Rebellion in the mid 1670s, and the lingering effects of a powerful hurricane that laid waste to a wide swathe of the James River basin in 1667, and a beginning planter like Thomas Pettus had many obstacles to overcome to make his plantation profitable (Craven 1949:174-199; Abbot 1957; Morgan 1975:243-244; Menard 1980).

Pettus's demographic environment also was in a state of flux as well. In the early 1670s roughly 30,000 people lived in the Virginia colony, and the population was growing at a clip of approximately 2.7 percent each year (McCusker and Menard 1986:133-136). Slaves accounted for about seven to ten percent of that total, between 2,500 to 3,000 souls (ibid.:134; Berlin 1998:369). The Utopia Quarter was located in James City County which at the time of the site's inception in the 1670s had a population of perhaps 2,000 to 2,500 total residents, with enslaved Africans numbering approximately 300 to 350 (Morgan 1975:412-413, 420-422). The number of indentured servants toiling locally, the other main source of labor, is unknown. Whereas in his father's day, indentured servant labor comprised the vast majority of the workforce, and as much as three-quarters of the population, Pettus II witnessed a shrinking labor pool of those same servants (Galenson 1981; Menard 1988). In the 1670s servants continued to outnumber slaves by roughly two to one (Menard 1977:362). Twenty years later, by the early 1690s, servants had virtually disappeared in the area; slaves constituted approximately 19 out of every 20 unfree laborers in adjacent York County (Kulikoff 1986:40-41; Menard 1977). Within little more than a decade between the mid 1670s and

the late 1680s there was a wholesale shift in the composition of Virginia labor force from servant to slave (Horn 1979:87; Walsh 2002:122-123).

Before the 1690s, when English indentured servants outnumbered African slaves, some historians assert that slaves generally benefited from the close proximity to English servants by receiving similar treatment, food rations, and a less taxing work routine (Walsh 2002:123). These first slaves at Utopia worked side by side with English servants in the fields, lived under the same roof, and may have eaten at the same table (see Morgan 1975:155-156, 319). Though not considered equals, many owners during this era, perhaps Pettus included, afforded some amount of social latitude to a slave population which remained relatively small. Not yet suffering from the full effects of race-based slavery, the initial slaves at living at Utopia may not have felt a pressing impetus to build social alliances with one another or to make the family the bastion of protection it would later become. Yet compared to the sex ratio of servants, in many cases slaves had a better opportunity at finding a spouse than did indentured servants (Morgan 1975:317-318).⁵

After owning and operating Littletown/Utopia for nearly 20 years, Thomas Pettus II died suddenly in 1690 (Fesler 2000:28). At the time of his death he was approximately 40 years old and left behind three children in the care of his second wife Mourning Glenn. Pettus's estate was inventoried in early 1691 (Appendix A). Before the inventory took place, Pettus's widow married James Bray II in late 1690 and appropriated an unknown portion of her deceased husband's property. A reference in the inventory

⁵ It also was not uncommon at the time for servants and slaves to have consensual sexual relations (Morgan 1975:331-338).

explains, "And as for the household Goods when we went to inventory them; att the time agreed on Mr. James Bray tould us that we came to late for he had Carried them away" (see Appendix A). All that remained to take stock of were the servants and slaves, the livestock, and an assortment of tableware. And based on the inventory, it appears that James Bray had gotten his hands on much of that as well, purchasing some of the hogs from the Pettus estate, but apparently plundering much else.

The inventory of the Pettus estate lists only one indentured servant boy and five "Negroes," all of whom almost certainly were enslaved (see Appendix A; Table 4.1).⁶ Based on the paucity of servants and slaves in the inventory, it is likely that James Bray had already "carried away" an unknown number of them prior to the inventory, or they had been sold to cover any debts Pettus may have had. In the 17th-century Chesapeake fieldhand productivity varied, but on average a healthy adult laborer could plant, tend, and harvest three to five acres of tobacco per growing season (see Carr et al. 1991:37-43; Menard 1980:145-146). Pettus owned more than 1,200 acres, meaning that with six field hands he would have been exploiting less than three percent of his available acreage each season, and that is assuming all six workers toiled in the fields fulltime. It is more likely that Pettus employed approximately 20 fieldhands, a combination of servants and slaves (see Fesler 2000:30).

At the very least, it appears doubtful that the inventory provides a full account of Pettus's bound workforce, with only four adults and two children listed at Littletown/Utopia. In his lifetime Pettus II may not have risen to the status of an elite

⁶ The indentured boy was listed with a surname, while the five Negroes lacked surnames, a further hint that they were enslaved.

Table 4.1. Partial list of slaves and servants owned by Thomas Pettus II in 1691.

Males	Females
Thomas Taylor, Indentured English boy	Nan, 30 years old
Briby, 32 years old	Moll, 32 years old
Sylliman, 50 years old	
Webb, 12 years old	

planter, but neither was he a yeoman farmer eking out a living on a few acres (see Kelso 1984:76-80).

The interrelationships of the five slaves are not enumerated in the inventory; the servant boy is listed first, then the male slaves, then the female slaves (see Appendix A). Based on their approximated ages, it is possible that the four adults formed two married pairs. The 20-year age difference between Sylliman and Nan and Moll would not have been unusual given the shortage of women at the time (see Kulikoff 1986:331-332, 356; Morgan 1998:86, 534). It is also tempting to suggest that 12-year-old Webb was the son of Nan or Moll. If so, he would have been born around 1680 when his mother was in her early twenties, which was close to the average age of first births among slave mothers at the time (Morgan 1998:90-93). It is likely that the four adult slaves were born in Africa and purchased by Pettus II or by his guardian before he came of age.

During the 20 years or so that Thomas Pettus II owned and operated a quarter at Utopia, he housed members of his indentured and enslaved workforce at the site. English indentured servants probably outnumbered African slaves at Utopia's inception, but slaves appear to have become the prevailing source of labor by 1690 when Pettus died. After 1690 Utopia might have been abandoned and sat idle. More likely the executors of Pettus's estate rented the site out to tenants as a way to earn capital for the estate to

payoff old debts or to place into a trust for his children. At some point between 1691 and 1700, probably while tenants inhabited the property, the main dwelling house at Utopia burned to the ground. The site was then abandoned for good until James Bray II formally obtained title to the property in 1700.

Based on the historical background of Period 1 Utopia, the conditions for slave family and household development are difficult to classify. Within 10 to 15 years, the complexion of the workforce changed so drastically for the region that establishing some sort of relative social stability must have been difficult for most slaves. Although Thomas Pettus operated a seemingly prosperous plantation, whether that translated to social stability for his bound laborers is unknown. The turnover of slaves at Utopia could have been rapid due to a high death rate, economic volatility, and the sociopolitical turmoil of the era.

In the 1670s and 1680s the opportunity for slaves to establish lasting bonds was less than ideal in the general area. However, there are tentative signs that some of the enslaved residents of Utopia had beaten the odds. It is within the realm of possibility that a small simple slave family had remained together as a unit at Utopia from 1679 to 1691. The demographic statistics for the area would argue against this. But if Thomas Pettus believed the best way to extract labor from his bound laborers was to provide them with a settled setting with a low turnover rate that allowed them to form married couples and bear children, his was a management philosophy that presaged his fellow planters by several generations.

History of Period 2 Utopia, 1700 – ca. 1730

By marrying Thomas Pettus II's widow, James Bray II succeeded in acquiring

much of Pettus's personal property, but he waited a decade before formally acquiring ownership of the Littletown/Utopia plantation. In 1700 several of Thomas Pettus II's heirs formally released the deed for Littletown/Utopia to James Bray II (Appendix B). At the time the deed was released archaeological evidence suggests that both the Pettus manor house and all the buildings at Utopia were no longer standing, having been destroyed by fire (Kelso 1984:74, 79; Fesler 2000:49-51). With deed in hand, Bray began construction of a large plantation house a few hundred yards west from where Pettus's plantation house once stood (see Figure 1.2). To the east at Utopia Bray reestablished a compound of slave quarters only a few dozen paces north of the original cottage at the site (see Figure 1.10).

James Bray II owned his Littletown/Utopia plantation for a quarter of a century, from 1700 until his death in 1725. He began operations just at a time when the flow of laborers to Virginia was in the process of radical change (Craven 1971; Galenson 1981; Kulikoff 1986:38-41; Menard 1977; 1988). Unlike the preceding generation, James II relied almost entirely on enslaved Africans to work his fields and perform most of the plantation tasks.⁷ Over the course of his ownership of Utopia Virginia's population increased substantially from approximately 64,000 people in 1700 to 100,000 by 1720 (Menard 1980:118-119; McCusker and Menard 1986:136). The percentage of slaves living in Virginia in 1700 stood at approximately 25 to 30 percent of the total population, and this remained steady up to 1720 (see Berlin 1998:369). Of the 13,000 slaves living in Virginia in 1700, half of those were born in Africa (Morgan 1998:61). By 1710 the

⁷ However, Bray employed a small number of English indentured servants, perhaps as skilled craftsmen, until the end of his life.

population of Virginia slaves was growing by natural increase at an annual rate of nearly one percent, in what has been characterized as "an unprecedented event for any New World slave population" (ibid.:81). By 1720 the population of Virginia slaves had more than doubled from 1700, and Africans still made up 45 percent of the total (ibid.:61). Throughout the first two decades of the 18th century the ratio of slave men to women remained high, although it was in a steady decline from 150 in 1700 to 130 in 1725 (ibid.:81-82). Within James City County the percentage of slaves in the population remained above the average, making up close to 40 percent of the local population by 1720 (Colonial Williamsburg Foundation 1986:232-233).

James Bray II's career as a tobacco planter corresponded with a period of generally stable economic conditions in the Chesapeake. Tobacco prices remained constant or improved slightly over most of his adult life (Menard 1980:113, 124, 142). In general, there is no evidence that economic conditions forced Bray to sell off slaves in desperation or to make management decisions that dramatically disrupted the lives of his slaves. In fact, under a 1705 Virginia law, Bray chose to entail his land and slaves. By placing his property under entail, Bray legally linked the slaves working at Littleton and Utopia with those tracts of land. This system was intended to guarantee that when the land was passed to an heir that there would be enough workers to make the land useful. Land without laborers was of little value to a Virginia planter (see Walsh 1997:44-45; Brewer 1997). Entail actually worked in favor of slave family stability because it protected slaves from being sold off the property by heirs, although it did not stop an heir from transferring slaves between his quarters and plantations. Compared to some of their friends and family on neighboring plantations, especially those on smaller plantations, the

Bray slaves benefited from his relative financial security and James II's desire to pass along a legacy of wealth to his children and grandchildren.

Shortly before he died in November 1725, Bray finalized his will, and his estate was probated in January 1726. The will and inventory provide an comprehensive snapshot of Bray's estate as it stood at the end of 1725, and offer a revealing sketch of how Bray managed his plantations (Appendix C). At the time of the probate James II owned 70 adult slaves, more than seven enslaved children⁸ and an unknown number of indentured servants. His landholdings ranged from several prominent lots in the town of Williamsburg to large plots of arable land in James City and York counties (see Appendix C). The detailed probate inventory only accounts for the 1,280 acres at Littleton/Utopia and the 2,220-acre Rockahock plantation located roughly 20 miles north and west of Williamsburg, near the Chickahominy River, a sign that he rented out all his remaining properties to tenants. Bray had more than 50 enslaved adults and children working at Rockahock, distributed among six separate quarters (Table 4.2). Closer to home, he worked 28 slaves at Littleton/Utopia, divided between two quarters known to him as "Debb's" and "Jacko's" and his home base at Littleton. Each of the eight quarter parcels and the home plantation functioned as a small farm.

Exactly how Bray distributed his human resources at his home plantation between Littleton, Debb's and Jacko's remains unknown (see Table 4.2). The 1725 inventory is more explicit about the staffing of slaves on the six outlying quarters at Rockahock plantation, listing the names and gender of the slaves at each (Table 4.3). A total of 46

⁸ Six of the children are listed by name (four boys and two girls), however in several instances the inventory lists "children," but provides no tally.

Table 4.2. Nine quarter farms owned by James Bray II in 1725, including Littletown.

	Adult Female Slaves	Adult Male Slaves	Overseer or Foreman	Horses	Other Livestock
Littletown	13	11		7	45
Debb's			Forewoman		48
Jacko's			Foreman		144
Rogers'	3	3	Overseer	4	53
Bridges	10	3	Overseer		57
Dubblenum's	3	3	Foreman	2	36
Nero's	3	2	Foreman		16
New Kent	8	3		1	37
Rockahock*	3	2			55
Totals	43	27		14	216

* Rockahock Quarter is just one of six quarters located on the larger Rockahock plantation.

enslaved adults were placed at the six quarters, ranging between a low of five adults at Nero's and Rockahock, to 13 adult slaves at Bridges. The ratio of men to women at four of the six outlying plantations was almost at parity, while at Bridges and New Kent women outnumbered men roughly three to one. Overall, 30 women (65 percent) and 16 men (35 percent) occupied the six outlying quarters, a ratio of close to two women for every man.

The predominance of women at Bridges and New Kent quarters is unusual for the time period. Most planters of the day preferred male laborers over female at a rate of two or three to one, believing men more capable of withstanding the severity of fieldwork (see Kulikoff 1986:66-68; Kolchin 1987:208; Stevenson 1996a:167; Treckel 1996:70;

Table 4.3. Enslaved staff working at six of James Bray's outlying quarter farms in 1725.

	Women		Men	Children	Equipment
Rogers' Quarter (8)	Sarah		Frank	Nanny	frying pan
	Judy		George	Simon	Large iron pot
	Dye		Ben		old gun
					warming pan
Bridges Quarter (13+)	Parthenia	Phillis	Luke	Children	iron pot
	Hannah	Maria	Thunder		
	Dinah	Janny	Peter		
	Patience	Parthenia			
	Betty	Lucy			
Dubblenum's Quarter (7)	Sarah		Dubblenum	a child	Pot
	Queen		Dick		
	Margaret		Sharper		
Nero's Quarter (5+)	Beauty		Nero	Children	
	Jammy		Cuffee		
	Amy				
New Kent Quarter (11)	Venus	Abigall	Jupiter		2 iron pots
	Nanny	Fanny	Cain		
	Bess	Patty	Tom		
	Esthar	Rachael			
Rockahock Quarter (5)	Juno		Ned		
	Elizabeth		Abell		
	Sugar				
Total = 49+	30		16	3+	

⁹ Ironically, few planters were aware that in the majority of West African cultures women did most of the agricultural field work, while many of the men in those same cultures were relatively unfamiliar with its rigors (Brown 1956:115; Page 1989:154-156; Kaim 1983:148; Mollason 1991:111, 356-22; Stevenson 1996a:171; Treckel 1996:67).

¹⁰ See Walsh (1997:117) for a discussion of the economic benefits and drawbacks to relying on natural increase versus regularly buying new slaves (see also Jordan 1968:70).

Walsh 1997:82-84).⁹ Bray's apparent preference for women may have been because he valued the reproductive capabilities of female slaves, whereas the majority of his contemporaries opted to buy newly arrived Africans when in need of more fieldhands.¹⁰ Or, given the inflated value that European slave traders placed on men, Bray may have chosen to purchase more African women as a cost saving measure (White 1985:64). He probably also understood that women tended to be more docile and less inclined to run away than men (Morgan 1998:526). In the end, market forces probably determined most of Bray's choices. For instance, slave ships embarking from the Bight of Biafra dominated the Chesapeake trade in the early 18th century, and these ships often carried more women than men for sale, making Bray's choices little more than an issue of supply and demand (Eltis 1998; Walsh 1997:79; Nwokeji 2001). For these reasons, and perhaps others, Bray apportioned his six outlying slave quarters with two adult women for every one adult man.

Yet the disproportionate number of women is deceiving. If the quarters at Bridges and New Kent were removed from the equation, virtual parity between men and women would have existed, as it did at Bray's home quarters (see Table 4.3). In all probability the divergence in numbers between enslaved men and women at Bridges and New Kent was a result of a specific directive from Bray. The majority of women living at Bridges and New Kent may have been new arrivals, with Bray choosing to group them together with a lesser number of new African men as a means to acclimate them to their

⁹ Ironically, few planters were aware that in the majority of West Africa cultures women did most of the agricultural field work, while many of the men in those same cultures were relatively unfamiliar with its rigors (Brown 1996:115; Fage 1989:154-156; Keim 1983:148; Meillassoux 1991:111, 356n22; Stevenson 1996a:171; Treckel 1996:67).

¹⁰ See Walsh (1997:117) for a discussion of the economic benefits and drawbacks to relying on natural increase versus regularly buying new slaves (see also Jordan 1968:70).

new situation. Therefore, Bridges and New Kent could have functioned as training and seasoning quarters, places where newly arrived slaves adjusted to the environment, to their enslavement, to the demands of fieldwork, and to the daily regimen that would characterize the remainder of their lives.¹¹ Planters usually intermixed seasoned slaves with new arrivals to speed the process of assimilation (Walsh 1997:83). Moreover, Bray may have realized that gang labor was the most efficient manner for controlling and extracting work from new workers unqualified to take on individual tasks or to work without supervision. Chesapeake planters tended to favor assigning women to gang labor, especially as the 18th century progressed (Carr and Walsh 1988:179; Morgan 1988). Whether by chance or design, having groups of enslaved African women cohabitate and work together at Bridges and New Kent replicated typical domestic social organization in many West and Central African cultures where women and men were often strictly segregated and this could have made the transition to slavery less demoralizing for some of these women (Casey 1991:142; Mullin 1992:172).

Based purely upon the numbers, the ratio of women to men at Bridges and New Kent could signal polygyny. Although in a few rare instances in Virginia enslaved men selected more than one wife, most tended to take only one partner, and that was probably the case for Bray's slaves. However, the presence of children at four of the six outlying quarters strongly suggests that conjugal pairings had occurred between adults at these

¹¹ In the 17th century early English settlers in Virginia, weakened by their voyage, and prone to disease and sickness in the New World, experienced a high death rate. The process of adjusting to the new environment was known as "seasoning," and in some cases "guest houses" were built help people make the transition, something akin to crude sanatoriums. Incoming new Africans underwent similar adjustments, and in an effort to reduce the high mortality rate, some planters attempted to gradually acclimate their new slaves, sometimes choosing one quarter as a seasoning station (for slave mortality rate, see Kulikoff 1986:69).

locations. In fact, it is tempting to suggest at Rogers', Dubblerum's and Nero's that most of the women and men had formed consensual unions. At Bridges two women named Parthenia strongly implies a mother and her Virginia-born teenage daughter were in residence (see Table 4.3). Whereas, the lack of children at New Kent and Rockahock may indicate that both quarters were populated primarily with recently purchased "new Negroes." Bray may have actively encouraged his slaves to form monogamous bonds as a mechanism of control, something that became standard practice by mid-century (Berlin 1998:129-131; Walsh 1997:83-84).

Two of the quarters—Rogers' and Bridges—appear to be named for white overseers. At Dubblerum's and Nero's, however, senior male slaves managed the quarter. New Kent and Rockahock are referenced by place names, making it unclear who served as authority figures there (see Table 4.3). According to the inventory, Rogers' was outfitted with the most equipment—a frying pan, iron pot, warming pan, and old gun—although the provisions were quite meager by any standard. Three of the other quarters had only pots listed, and at two of them the inventory itemized no equipment at all (see Table 4.3).

Because of the presence of a gun and four of the seven horses, Rogers' may have functioned as the principal outlying quarter, a place from which Mr. Rogers supervised the other five quarters.¹² As for the gun at Rogers', firearms were a common sight at most remote quarters and used for hunting, keeping animals away from crops, and personal protection. While indiscriminately arming slaves was strictly outlawed, at

¹²On the other hand, horses could have been regularly dispatched between quarters, and happened by chance to be congregated at Rogers' at the time of the inventory.

“frontier” locations a slave could use and carry a gun if the owner or overseer obtained a permit (Hening 1969:II:481, IV:131; Walsh 1997:91).¹³

Within the boundaries of his 1,280-acre Littletown/Utopia plantation, Bray maintained an additional 24 adult slaves and four children at his home base at Littletown and at the two nearby field quarters managed by a slave foreman Jacko, and a forewoman Debb (Table 4.4). Based upon an examination of the topography, soil fertility, landscape features, and previous archaeological surveys throughout the entire Kingsmill property, the locations of Bray’s three field quarters—Littletown, Debb’s, and Jacko’s—probably have been identified and excavated. For instance, the workforce for Bray’s Littletown likely was headquartered at the plantation itself, either in buildings sited next to the main house, or in a small nearby outbuilding (Kelso 1973:17-20; Kelso 1977:85-86; Kelso 1984:104-106). The Utopia site functioned as either Debb’s or Jacko’s Quarter. The other location of Debb’s or Jacko’s may have been situated at a site dubbed Littletown Quarter in the 1970s and located a mere 1,000’ north from the Bray plantation house, or at a site called Tutter’s Neck located one and a half miles to the northwest from Bray’s house (Noel Hume 1968; Kelso 1974:7-8, 1984:106-110) (Figure 4.2).¹⁴

The inventory fails to indicate how Bray apportioned his slaves between Littletown, Debb’s and Jacko’s, perhaps a sign that there was some amount of fluidity

¹³ At the Utopia Quarter archaeologists recovered lead shot, gun flints, gun parts, and numerous flint chips created while making gun flints, ample proof that the residents at this “non-frontier” location maintained firearms on site, probably without a permit to do so.

¹⁴ According to the inventory the majority of livestock, including the only sheep on the plantation were kept at Jacko’s (see Table 4.2). Yet the layout of the Utopia site does not reflect large-scale animal penning, nor does the faunal assemblage indicate an increase in sheep elements. In fact, caprines (sheep and goats) comprise 1.17 percent of the Period 2 faunal assemblage. The percentage of caprine elements at four other similar sites in Virginia dating to the same period averaged 1.78 percent (see Walsh et al. 1997:238-241). Although hardly scientific, it does not appear that Utopia contains an unusually high percentage of sheep elements, thereby providing tentative evidence that it was not the site of Jacko’s.

Table 4.4. Enslaved staff working at Littletown, Debb's, and Jacko's in 1725.

Women	Men	Girls	Boys	Total
Moll	Sam	Lucy	Spring	
Dye	Jack		Martin	
Janny	Caesar		Daniel	
Batty	Tom			
Flora	Jupiter			
Doll	Jacko			
Nanny	May			
Hope	Orson			
Debb	Mark			
Augor	Brinee			
Juno	Sandy			
Judy				
Pegg				
13	11	1	3	28

between the three venues and people moved about frequently depending upon staffing needs. At the six outlying quarters Bray placed an average of eight adults at each.

Typically, most field quarters in this era housed eight to ten adults (Kolchin 1993:33; Kulikoff 1986:330-331; Morgan 1998:36; Mullin 1972:48). Planters considered more than ten to 15 slaves at any one quarter the maximum that an overseer could manage efficiently (Walsh 1997:87, 289n26).

Of the 24 adult slaves Bray kept close to him at Littletown, Debb's and Jacko's, the sex ratio almost reached parity--13 women and 11 men (see Table 4.4). As at several of the outlying quarters, whether a close gender ratio indicates the majority of the 24 adults had formed conjugal pairs remains unknown. Although the ratio of men to women

at the home plantation and at four of the six outlying quarters was close to equal, as a whole, there appears to have been a shortage of marriage partners for some of the 43 adult women under Bray's control. Some of these women may have had to look outside the immediate confines of the quarters for mates. Given the apparent scarcity of women in the region at the time, it can be surmised that most of Bray's female slaves were able to form unions.

James Bray placed slaves in charge at four of his eight field quarters outside of Littletown. This was somewhat of a rarity in the early 18th-century Chesapeake (Morgan 1998:218). Virginia law at the time mandated that planters install a "christian overseer" (i.e. white Englishman) at each field quarter, otherwise the planter became liable for any crimes committed by slaves lacking such supervision (Hening 1969:III:102-103). Moreover, those who failed to control their slaves, risked epidemic episodes of running away, or worse, possible violent retaliation. Bray surely was aware of the foiled 1709 uprising planned by several dozen slaves in James City, Isle of Wight, and Surry Counties, and likely took precautions to prevent his slaves from joining any insurgencies (ibid.:234-236, 242-243, 575). Perhaps only later, once the adult population of the quarter began to stabilize did Bray feel confident to begin placing his senior slaves in charge.

In the Chesapeake region foreman typically attained their status by proving their value as prime fieldhands (Morgan 1998:220, 342; Walsh 1997:86-87). Often, then, a foreman's chief responsibility was to set the pace for other fieldhands. In return, he

¹⁵ Bray's wealthy contemporary, Robert "King" Carter, appointed slave foreman at 43 of his 48 field quarters, apparently using the position as a reward and mechanism for keeping his slaves in line (Morgan 1998:208; Walsh 1997:86).

¹⁶ Later in the 19th century a few make references to slave women serving as drivers, primarily leading gangs of other women and children (see Carr and Walsh 1988; Fogel 1989:45-49; Mann 1990:139).

might receive the privilege of living in his own dwelling house, and perhaps provisions equal to an overseer (Walsh 1997:86).¹⁵

Given the demographic snapshot of Bray's slaves in 1725, apparently he employed slave women at the same tasks as enslaved men, and in the case of Debb, a woman assumed the role of authority figure. An 18th-century slave forewoman like Debb is almost unheard of in the history books.¹⁶ In the Chesapeake, a slave woman's stage of life or marital status usually determined her social position (Shammas 1985:25-26). In some West and Central African cultures post-menopausal or celibate women sometimes achieved positions of leadership because of their desexualized status (see Ardener 1981:16; Barley 1994:63; Callaway 1981:172; 174; Sudarkasa 1987:38; Terborg-Penn 1987:51). Often these female elders attained powerful positions through special spiritual skills, healing, midwifery, or divination (Amadiume 1987; Goheen 1996; Steady 1987:17). Possibly, the residents of the quarter recognized and respected certain abilities Debb possessed, perhaps based on indigenous values such as age or spiritual power. Bray probably did not know or care how Debb attained her status; to him she simply may have been the slave with the most seniority at Utopia. Whatever the case, Bray seems to have accepted the authority her fellow slaves conferred on her and followed the will of the community by openly recognizing Debb as its most eminent member.

¹⁵ Bray's wealthy contemporary, Robert "King" Carter, appointed slave foremen at 43 of his 48 field quarters, apparently using the position as a reward and mechanism for keeping his slaves in line (Morgan 1998:208; Walsh 1997:86).

¹⁶ Later in the 19th century a few make reference to slave women serving as drivers, primarily leading gangs of other women and children (see Carr and Walsh 1988; Fogel 1989:45-49; Mann 1990:139).

Based on what can be extrapolated from the historical background of Period 2 Utopia, the slaves living at the site under James Bray II's ownership faced relatively favorable conditions for household and family development. Although Bray continually introduced "new Negroes" to Utopia which must have caused episodes of social instability, as these newcomers were absorbed into the existing community, they increased the pool of potential mates and eventually improved the overall prospect for household and family formation. If stability was defined as a low likelihood to be sold away from the plantation, the documentary evidence suggests that Bray provided a stable environment. Bray did not traffic in slaves, except those that were chronic runaways or otherwise causing problems. He probably had no compunction to shifting slaves from quarter to quarter, meaning it was possible to be separated from friends or kin by upwards of 20 miles. Indeed, a transfer of one of the Littletown/Utopia slaves to Rogers' or Dubblerum's Quarter or vice versa would have had a dramatic bearing on household and family organization at both places, causing a void at one and forcing an accommodation at the other.

Yet, if stability was defined as the opportunity to reside in a coresidential group or a household whose membership remained reasonably unchanged for long periods of time, then life at Utopia was stable, especially in comparison to other plantations. The 24 adults living at Littletown, Debb's and Jacko's in 1725 formed a pliable plantation group that lived in close communication and close proximity, if not sometimes under the same roof. By comparison, in 1720 only 13 percent of Virginia's slaves lived in units larger than 20 people, while the majority resided in groups of ten or less, and 30 percent lodged with five or fewer slaves (Morgan 1998:41). Larger living units improved a slave's

opportunities to engineer and maintain long-term relationships and form lasting bonds.

While it seems likely that James Bray had little regard for the emotional and physical wellbeing of his slaves beyond the bare necessities, he was wealthy enough, and operating his plantations at enough of a profit to allow for flexibility. Compared to Thomas Pettus II, James II was in a better position to compromise on some issues relating to the quality of life of his slaves, including an improvement in the climate for family and household advancement.

History of Period 3 Utopia, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750

With the death of James Bray II in 1725 whatever continuity or relative stability the Utopia slaves may have enjoyed was placed in jeopardy. The fact that James II had entailed his property provided some security that there would not be a wholesale sell-off of slaves. Yet, the possibility that established households and families, those that might have formed by 1725, could be disrupted by shifts in staffing or changes in management needs was ever apparent. For the next 20 years slaves living at Littletown/Utopia had the misfortune to experience four ownership changes.

By his will James Bray II temporarily left Littletown/Utopia and the slaves living there to his daughter Elizabeth Allen until his grandson James Bray III reached adulthood in 1736 and could claim ownership of the property.¹⁷ Elizabeth Allen did not operate Littletown/Utopia for long, selling her rights to the Littletown/Utopia plantation in 1728 to her brother Thomas Bray II for £500 (Stephenson 1963:19; Winfree 1971:382;

¹⁷ If something should happen to James III, the will stipulated that the plantation was to revert to his father Thomas Bray II (see Appendix C).

Gunderson 1998:77). Thomas II operated Littletown/Utopia for eight years until 1736 when its rightful heir, James Bray III turned 21 years of age.

Thomas II's purchase of the plantation in 1728 seems to have initiated a period of volatility for the slaves attached to it. In 1732 he petitioned the General Assembly for the right to "dock" or suspend the entail on some of the properties he had inherited from his father (including Littletown/Utopia) claiming much of the land was a "Burthen instead of a Benefit" because he did not have "a sufficient Number of Slaves" to work his properties (Winfrey 1971:381-384). Entail prevented him from selling any of the land or slaves as a way to pay off any of his debts (see Walsh 1997:44). The Assembly granted Thomas II the authority to sell some of his smaller tracts of land up to a limit of £2,000 with the understanding that the funds were to be reinvested in additional slaves that would eventually belong to his son (Winfrey 1971:382-383). By 1738 Thomas II had purchased at least 44 slaves and presumably integrated them into his existing slave population (McIlwaine 1910:228-229, 330, 384-385, 395-396).

Although Thomas II never contemplated putting Littletown/Utopia on the market, the sell-off signaled a period of change and instability for all slaves living under his control. For the slaves at Utopia the source of potential instability occurred on three fronts. First, any slaves living on lands that were sold had to be shifted onto the remaining plantations. This may have meant that some family members or relatives were reunited, but more likely this simply caused unwelcome alterations in the composition of households. Households were further thrown into disarray when Thomas II purchased the 44 new slaves, probably all Africans, with some of the funds from the land sale. These newcomers had to be integrated into the existing population of slaves, an even

more unwelcome experience. Thirdly, there was nothing stopping Thomas II from moving individuals or groups of slaves from place to place as he re-staffed the plantations that remained under his control.

When James Bray III reached 21 years of age in 1736 he took charge of the Littletown/Utopia plantation and operated it for eight years until he died in 1744. Like his grandfather, and unlike his father, James III set up housekeeping at Littletown, making it his plantation seat and center of operations (Kelso 1984:37-40) (see Figure 1.2). Thomas II and James III operated Littletown/Utopia in the second quarter of the 18th century, an era that saw the population of Virginia more than double from approximately 100,000 in 1720 to 237,000 by 1750 (McCusker and Menard 1986:136). The African-American population was growing at a faster rate than that of the Anglo-Americans rising from approximately 26,000 in 1720 to 107,000 in 1750, a more than four-fold increase (Berlin 1998:369). By 1750 slaves made up 46 percent of the colony's population, while in James City County slaves accounted for 50 to 60 percent of the population (*ibid.*; Morgan 1998:98). While the numbers of slaves increased between 1720 and 1750, the percentage of Africans among them dropped from 45 percent in 1720 to 21 percent by 1750 (Morgan 1998:61). In the 1730s the rate of natural increase reached 3.0 percent annually, and this soared to an astounding 4.7 percent in the 1740s (*ibid.*:81). The slave sex ratio continued to stabilize, falling from 130 in 1725 to 120 by mid century, although in some of the older, more settled counties like James City the sex ratio almost reached parity (*ibid.*:82).

For Virginia planters like Thomas Bray II and his son James Bray III, the tobacco economy entered a period of stagnation in the 1730s and 1740s, neither growing nor

declining significantly. Production costs and tobacco prices generally remained constant (McCusker and Menard 1985:120, 124). In the last few years of the 1740s the sputtering tobacco industry began to get back on track, and a new period of steady, robust growth occurred, probably too late to improve the economic fortunes of James III. In fact, there is strong evidence that James III struggled financially throughout his short career as a planter and was in debt at the end of his life (McClure 1977).¹⁸ The source of his troubles, like those of his father, was his inability to freely manage his land and slaves under the terms of entail he inherited (McClure 1977:16-17; see also Burwell v. Johnson 1758).

While tobacco was the principal commodity produced at Littletown/Utopia, a significant amount of slave labor was devoted toward a diverse array of crops and small industries. James III seems to have discovered the benefits of diversification somewhat earlier than most of his peers, apparently because of economic necessity more than by design (see McCusker and Menard 1985:130-133). During the eight years he operated Littletown/Utopia, James III sold for profit corn, wheat, fodder, oats, peas, onions, various species of livestock, butchered meat from his herds, wool, butter, tallow, animal hair, cider, brandy, lime, bricks, and firewood (McClure 1977:67-73, 77-94; Walsh et al. 1997:136). James III also operated a mill on his property that ground both corn and wheat for his neighbors for a fee (McClure 1977:87-89). In addition, he rented out some of his vacant landholdings to tenants (ibid.:52-53).

¹⁸ James Bray III kept a ledger for the eight years that he operated Littletown/Utopia and it is this remarkable document that traces his financial travails (Burwell Papers). I have relied on two sources of detailed analyses of the ledger in McClure (1977) and Walsh et al. (1997).

To manage the day-to-day operations at Littletown/Utopia, James III employed at least five overseers and paid them in shares of the crops they produced (McClure 1977:41, 46). The available evidence indicates that John Green managed Utopia from 1740 to James III's death in 1744 (McClure 1977:42-43). During those five years Green received shares of tobacco, corn, pork, and even a small amount of butter, which suggests that these were commodities specifically produced by the slaves working at Utopia (ibid.).

The exact number is not known, but James III may have owned as many as 80 to 90 slaves at the end of his life, distributed between Littletown/Utopia, Tutter's Neck, and other properties in the region (McClure 1977:50-51; Kelso 1984:38-39; Walsh et al. 1997:14) (see Figure 4.2). By agreement with Thomas II in 1745, James III's widow Frances Thacker Bray received some 27 slaves as her dower share along with two additional slaves, Deaf Lucy and Ester, and the Utopia acreage of the Littletown/Utopia plantation (Burwell v. Johnson 1758) (Table 4.5). According to later accounts an unknown number of James III's slaves "were Tradesmen and House Servants, no Ways concerned in the Crop" (ibid.) and at least one of his slaves was a cooper whom he hired out locally for short periods of time (McClure 1977:95).

It is impossible to know whether the sex ratio of the group of 27 slaves is representative of James III's entire population. What is more telling is the ratio of children and adults on the 1745 list. For this small group the ratio of children to women is 157, near equal to the ratio for Virginia slaves at the time (see Morgan 1998:83). The ratio strongly suggests that the Bray slaves were producing children by natural increase. Among the children Joe Boy and Austin were likely sons or close kin of Boy and Austin,

Table 4.5. List of slaves belonging to James Bray III that were transferred to the ownership of his widow Frances Thacker Bray in 1745.¹⁹

Women	Men	Older Children		Young Children		Total
		Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	
Nanny*	Martin*	Sarah ^d	Great Lewis	Nanny	Little Sam ^c	
Phillis	Daniel*		Joe Boy	Patience	Jupiter ^b	
Juno*	Dick		Milla	Sukey	Mars	
Beck	Austin		Austin			
Ebo	Charles					
Moll*	York					
Mulatta Pat	Ned					
Deaf Lucy ^{a*}	Cesar*					
Ester ^a	Boy					
7 (9^a)	9	1	4	3	3	27 (29^a)

^a These two female slaves were chosen by Frances Bray to resolve a separate matter and not part of the original 27.

^b Jupiter is listed as "Doll's son." There is no Doll among the 27, although a woman named Doll was present at Littletown/Utopia in 1725 (see Table 4.4). This may mean that a mother and her son were separated. It is also possible that the scribe intended to write "Moll's son" and made an error, and if so, then mother and son were not separated. Jupiter may be the son of the Jupiter listed for James II in 1725 (see Table 4.4).

^c An adult male Sam is listed for James II in 1725, probably the father of Little Sam here (see Table 4.4).

^d A slave named Sarah (along with one named Jeremiah) reputedly was Frances Bray's personal maidservant, a gift from her father (Burwell v. Johnson 1758). The Sarah listed here, a probable teenager, may very well be the same person.

*Corresponds with a name listed at Littletown/Utopia in 1725 under James Bray II's ownership.

and Nanny was the mother of the girl by the same name (see Table 4.5). With no evidence to the contrary, it is probable that most or all of the other children listed in the group were attached to one or both parents, although Great Lewis and Little Sam seemed to be without their fathers.

¹⁹ My thanks to Lorena Walsh for advising me on the likely demographic breakdown of the 27 slaves (see also Walsh 1997:252-253).

The names of three men and four women are found on both James II's 1725 inventory and James III's in 1745.²⁰ Martin and Daniel appear as children in 1725 and are listed as prime adults in 1745. Nanny may have been a late adolescent in 1725 and is the prime adult woman in 1745, and also has a daughter of her own. Caesar also may have been a young adult in 1725 and was in his prime by 1745, as may have been the case for Juno. The reverse could have been true for Moll; a prime adult in 1725, by 1745 she may have been one of the older females in the group of 27. As for the Lucy listed as a child in 1725, it is possible she is the same person listed as an adult as Deaf Lucy in 1745 (cf., Tables 4.4 and 4.5).

Based on names, some of the 29 slaves in Frances Bray's dowry may have been African-born. Among the adults classical or place names like Cesar, Juno, and York suggest that these names were imposed on new Negroes, and Ebo almost certainly was in reference to her place of origin (see Table 4.5). Thomas II had purchased at least 44 new Negroes in the latter 1730s and integrated them into the existing population of slaves (McIlwaine 1910:384-385). The list of 29 probably includes some of those people. The presence of Mulatta Pat, the child of a European or Anglo-American father and an African or creole mother is an intriguing entry that alludes to a variety of backgrounds for the Bray slave population. As far as the presence of families and households among the 27 slaves on the 1745 list, it would seem most individuals on the list were interrelated by blood or marriage.

²⁰ On both lists the adults appear to be ranked roughly by value, the prime fieldhands at the head of the list, and less productive older adults or adolescents toward the end.

Some of the 29 slaves in Frances Bray's dowry, or associated with it, appear in other contexts and provide a glimpse into their lives. In 1730, while under Thomas Bray II's ownership, Martin was caught stealing meat and several gallons of wine and rum from a York County plantation. He received 39 lashes as punishment (Willis 1995:175). This is the same Martin listed on both the 1725 and 1745 lists (see Tables 4.4 and 4.5). In 1739 Thomas II was a subscriber of an advertisement for a runaway slave named Phil who spoke broken English and had arrived from Africa around 1735 (*Virginia Gazette* 2 February 1738/39).²¹ Phil could have been one of the 44 slaves purchased by Thomas II with the proceeds from the land sale. In 1749 a slave named Sam belonging to Thomas II was found guilty of the nighttime theft of butter from a neighbor's dairy. Sam was whipped and burned on the hand as punishment (Willis 1995:204). This Sam may have been the father of Little Sam as listed in Frances Bray's dowry in 1745 (see Table 4.5).

According to his ledger, James III hired out some of his slaves periodically for periods of time ranging from a day or two to a year. In 1741 he hired out Jupiter for a year and in 1743 he hired out Simon for six months (McClure 1977:49). Jupiter may be the same person owned by James II in 1725 (see Table 4.4), and the same one who fathered Doll's son Jupiter on the 1745 list (see Table 4.5).

Based on what can be gleaned from the background histories of Thomas Bray II and James Bray III the conditions for slave family and household development at Utopia can be characterized as volatile. Both Thomas II and James III felt burdened by entailed land and slaves, and at one time James III considered ridding himself of older, less

²¹ The primary subscriber of the notice is Robert Dudley of King and Queen County. Thomas II seems to have been a secondary subscriber of the ad.

productive slaves in an effort to alleviate debt.²² Both owners appeared to have had no compunction about shifting slaves between plantations. In the 1730s Thomas II introduced at least 44 new slaves, and possibly more than twice that number, into his existing population of slaves and this must have triggered periods of social agitation. However, it can be inferred from the 1745 list of Frances Bray's 27 dower slaves that most children were not separated from their mothers. Fathers, on the other hand, do not appear to be as well represented in the group of 27. The list of 27 slaves probably was the result of negotiation between Thomas Bray II and France Bray Burwell and her new husband Lewis Burwell IV. The potential absence of fathers in the group suggests that the Brays and Burwells were not particularly concerned with keeping nuclear family groups together that included a father. Also, it is possible that the fathers of some of the children were living abroad, owned by other planters.

The conditions for slave families to grow were contingent upon many factors, but length of coresidence and group size proved to be two of the most significant ones. The longer a group was able to reside together in a unit and the more people within that unit, the better chance for family development. Given the changes in ownership of Utopia in 1728, 1736, and 1745, the economic instability that James III experienced between 1736 and 1744, and the various attempts by Thomas II and James III to rid themselves of land and slaves throughout the period, it can be assumed that the Utopia slaves did not enjoy long-term household continuity. Therefore, the opportunity to coreside with the same group of people at Utopia for any length of time, at least long enough to form alliances,

²² James III once consulted a friend on whether he should allow the local sheriff to seize some of his slaves as payment for some debts, particularly "some of his old Slaves which were of little Use to him" (Burwell v. Johnson 1758).

procreate, and raise children was uncertain for Period 3. However, group size was growing gradually. By 1740 approximately 50 percent of Virginia's slaves lived in units of 11 or more people. Some 17 percent of that number lived in units larger than 20 people, a slight rise since 1720 (Morgan 1998:41). Overall, compared to 20 years earlier in Period 2, the residents of Period 3 Utopia probably had similar prospects for family development; the length of residence may have declined compared to the earlier period, but the size of the group living at Utopia seems to have grown, likely offsetting some of the instability caused by Thomas II's and James III's management decisions.

History of Period 4 Utopia, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775

The sudden death of James Bray III had a direct impact on the slaves living and working at Utopia. He died without issue and attempted to leave his estate to his wife Frances (McClure 1977:17-19). However, because of the entail placed on his properties, James III's land and slaves reverted to his father Thomas Bray II.²³ Frances Bray married the owner of the neighboring Kingsmill plantation Lewis Burwell IV in January 1745, less than four months after her husband died (Stephenson 1963:19). Immediately prior to the marriage, Thomas Bray II agreed to deed the Utopia property and 29 slaves to Frances in exchange for relinquishing her dower rights (see Table 4.5) (Burwell v. Johnson 1758).²⁴

²³ A widow such as Frances Bray typically received a one-third share of her spouse's estate as a dower right, while the primary male heir, in this case Thomas II, controlled the remainder (Dollarhide 2001).

²⁴ The ownership of Bray slaves and property was disputed in a series of court cases in the 1750s and 1760s. James Bray III's sister Elizabeth Bray Johnson and her husband Philip Johnson inherited Littletown in 1751 when her father Thomas Bray II died (see Figure 4.3). Lewis Burwell IV and Frances Bray Burwell initiated a long running suit in an attempt to acquire the Littletown slaves that had been entailed by James Bray II in 1725 (Burwell v. Johnson 1758; Burwell Petition 1759; Privy Council Registers 1738-1778; see also McClure 1977:17-19).

In all likelihood, the majority of the 29 slaves Frances Burwell received as her dower share with the Utopia property were living and working at the quarter at the time (see Table 4.5). In fact, for the slaves living at Utopia the transition from Bray to Burwell ownership in early 1745 may have been fairly seamless at first. According to a 1746 entry in James Bray III's ledger by his executors after his death, Burwell IV purchased "Fodder used at Utopia" from Bray's estate (McClure 1977:72). Moreover, there is strong evidence that James Bray III's overseer John Green continued supervising Utopia for Lewis Burwell IV into the late 1740s (McClure 1977:42-43).

Lewis Burwell IV owned and operated Utopia for 30 years, from 1745 to 1775, occupying the nearby 1,500-acre Kingsmill plantation and its impressive mansion house (Kelso 1984:44-45, 87-96; Walsh 1997:43) (Figure 4.3). Concerned about the conflict brewing with Great Britain, Lewis IV pulled up stakes at Kingsmill and Utopia in 1775, deeded the plantation to his son Lewis V, and moved several hundred miles west to an estate in Mecklenburg County known as "The Oaks" (Goodwin 1963:27-28; Wells 1976:25-26). Thirty years earlier Lewis IV had patented land in what would become Mecklenburg County. By 1752 he had established a quarter on the property, and continued to invest resources in the enterprise throughout the 1750s and 1760s, apparently accruing a sizeable debt in the process (Walsh 1997:211).

Like the Bray's Littletown plantation, Kingsmill had been placed under entail in the early 18th century by the family patriarch Lewis Burwell II. In the ensuing years, the heirs grappled with the entail, sometimes succeeding in ridding themselves of portions of it (see Hening 1969:IV:534-537, VII:343-345; see also Goodwin 1963:xxvii-xxviii; Wells 1976:20-21). However, the entail on the Kingsmill plantation itself proved to be a

major fiscal handicap, difficult to remove or circumvent. Before moving west in 1775, Burwell sold off some of his tidewater slaves not restricted by entail, probably including some of the Utopia residents, and others were auctioned to pay Burwell's many creditors (Walsh 1997:211).

Lewis V operated Kingsmill for the next six years, however, given his father's extensive reduction of the slave labor force by sale and relocation, activity ceased at the Utopia Quarter probably by 1775 or soon thereafter, while Lewis V continued farming at Kingsmill proper. The property became the focal point of several skirmishes during the American Revolution, causing extensive damage to the plantation, prompting Lewis V to place Kingsmill/Utopia up for sale in 1781 (Goodwin 1963:81-82, 85-89; Wells 1976:30, 36). By 1783 the property had been sold. Maps made during the later years of the American Revolution depict the general Kingsmill area, and there is no evidence of activity at Utopia by 1781 (Figures 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6).

Virginia's demography changed considerably between 1745 and 1775 when Lewis Burwell IV operated Kingsmill/Utopia. In 1750 the population of Virginia numbered roughly 237,000 people, and by 1780 this number had more than doubled to approximately 538,000 (McCusker and Menard 1986:136). Throughout this same period Virginia's slave population continued to grow apace, expanding from around 107,000 persons in 1750 to more than 187,000 in 1770, and nearly 300,000 by 1790 (Berlin 1998:369). Much of the slave population growth was due to an astounding rate of annual natural increase that peaked at nearly five percent in the 1740s and dropped to roughly half that rate in the early 1770s (Kulikoff 1977b; Morgan 1998:81). Concurrent with the gradual reduction of the slave trade and the rise in natural increase, the percentage of

African-born slaves dropped dramatically over Lewis IV's lifetime, going from approximately 21 percent in 1750 to five percent in 1780 (Morgan 1998:61). The ratio of slave men to women trended downward between 1745 and 1775 from roughly 130 to 110, almost reaching equivalence (*ibid.*:82). Between 1750 and 1790, slaves generally accounted for between 40 and 50 percent of the colony's inhabitants (Berlin 1998:369). However, in James City County in 1750 slaves made up over 50 percent of the local population, and this number rose to more than 60 percent by 1775, the highest ratio of slaves in all of Virginia (Morgan 1998:98-99). By the 1750s, approximately 60 percent of Virginia's slaves lived in groups of 11 or more, and more than 30 percent lived on plantations with more than 21 slaves (*ibid.*:41).

Lewis Burwell IV operated Kingsmill/Utopia during a long period of general economic stability up to the American Revolution (McCusker and Menard 1985:120). Part of Lewis IV's success was due to his progressive attitude toward plantation diversification (see Carr and Walsh 1988; Walsh 1989; Walsh et al. 1997:12-13). Fields that once had been devoted exclusively for tobacco were planted in wheat, corn, and other grains. Throughout the third quarter of the 18th century most Chesapeake planters raised both wheat and tobacco (Walsh 1989:402-403; see also McCusker and Menard 1985:129-133). And like James Bray III, planters in the Williamsburg area such as Lewis IV took advantage of customers in the colonial capital anxious to buy essentials such as firewood, meat, building materials, and other raw goods from the outlying plantations (see Walsh et al. 1997; see also Goodwin 1963:xxx; Wells 1976:24-25, 70-90).

The diversification of the plantation economy in the second half of the 18th century had a direct effect on the lives of most slaves. As the number and types of jobs

increased, the work routines of many plantation slaves changed. Whereas gang labor had predominated on many tobacco plantations, diversification introduced a system of task-oriented jobs, performed individually or in small groups (Carr and Walsh 1988:166; Morgan 1988). Under a task system, slaves who completed the assigned job in some cases were allowed the luxury of personal time; this produced an increasing degree of independence and a sense of individuality for certain slaves who were able to find moments of respite from overseer or owner interference.

With diversification, the amount of skilled labor positions also increased, and some slaves, mostly men, benefited. For example, grain production required plowing. Not only did plow agriculture necessitate experienced plowmen, but an entire infrastructure to support it including the care and maintenance of draft animals, blacksmithing to produce and repair the plowing equipment, and skilled laborers to harvest and process the wheat, including millers (see Carr and Walsh 1988). In turn, a more prominent division of labor occurred within the slave workforce, with skilled jobs becoming increasingly a man's domain, and women continuing to be relegated to manual labor and fieldwork (ibid.:166, 176-177). At the very least, the movement towards plantation diversification at places like Utopia altered the economic reliance on tobacco, and changed the social balance within slave communities.

Like all his contemporaries, Lewis IV relied on overseers to manage much of the day-to-day work on his plantations. There are only a few ambiguous references to specific overseers employed by Burwell, such as the aforementioned John Green at Utopia (McClure 1977:42-43), and no record of how any of the overseers operated,

²⁷ For example, 20 of 24 slaves on one of the properties owned by Burwell IV's father in 1736 lived in three simple family groups consisting of eight, seven, and five members, an indication that Lewis III, and probably later Lewis IV, were cognizant of slave families (see Walsh 1997).

whether they lived at the quarters with groups of slaves, or if Lewis IV promoted some of his senior slaves to foremen.

Lewis IV's care and treatment of his slaves appears to be relatively reflective of the gradual changes in management strategies that were occurring in the mid 18th century. Periodically he hired doctors to attend to the ailments of his slaves, to extract abscessed teeth, and he hired midwives to help some of the mothers deliver their babies (Walsh 1997:173-177). He also allowed his slaves to be baptized. Baptism records for Bruton Parish Church have survived for the years 1747 to 1768. Within that period at least 73 of Lewis IV's slaves were baptized, meaning that by the 1760s and 1770s the majority of his slave population had been Christianized in the Anglican church (ibid.:153, 249-251). Medical care and baptisms served as benign forms of control for Lewis IV, although he was not unfamiliar with more violent measures to exact obedience and order at Kingsmill/Utopia if necessary (see ibid.:118).

By the 1750s records indicate that the majority of Burwell IV's Kingsmill/Utopia slaves were related by blood or marriage (see Walsh 1997). Most of the adults lived in simple families, some that stretched back several generations.²⁵ By the latter 1740s the slaves under Lewis IV's control probably were bearing children and maturing at a fast enough rate that he purchased few if any additional imported Africans. Between the 1710s and 1740s the majority of the slaves purchased by Burwell planters were from the Niger Delta region of West Africa, many from the Igbo culture area (ibid.; see also Walsh

²⁵ For example, 20 of 24 slaves on one of the properties owned by Burwell IV's father in 1736 lived in three simple family groups consisting of eight, seven, and five members, an indication that Lewis III, and probably later Lewis IV, were cognizant of slave families (see Walsh 1997).

2001). Nonetheless, the last record of an African slave purchase associated with Lewis IV was in 1752 (Walsh 1997:116).

In addition to the list of the 29 slaves the Burwells received as Frances' dower share in 1745 (see Table 4.5), tax lists survive for Lewis IV's James City County slave population for the years 1768 and 1769, and for Mecklenburg County for the years 1782 and 1783. Presumably, all but two of the 29 slaves listed in 1745 were attached to Utopia at the time since the Utopia property itself was conveyed to the Burwells with the slaves. An examination of the 1745 list indicates that the sex ratio of the group was nearly even, and the ratio of children to adult women suggests that this particular group of slaves were producing children by natural increase (see Table 4.5). Moreover, there was some longevity and continuity for this group of slaves that stretched back to 1725 (cf., Tables 4.4 and 4.5). While families and households can not be determined from the list of 29 slaves, by inference, most of them seem to have been related by blood or marriage.

Nearly 25 years elapsed before two limited tax lists of Burwell's slaves are available for the years 1768 and 1769. In 1768 Lewis IV was taxed in James City County for 65 tithes and the following year for 62 (Goodwin 1963:xxxi). Almost all the tithes were adult slaves, meaning that he owned between 50 and 60 adults and perhaps twice that number if children are included. Thus, by the late 1760s it would appear that Burwell owned roughly 100 slaves in James City County, placing an unknown number of them at Utopia.

The historical record is again mute for almost 15 years until two surviving lists were made of Lewis Burwell IV's slaves for the years 1782 and 1783 (Appendix D). The lists were transcribed from Lewis IV's own hand and divided into a half dozen taxable

groups (Tables 4.6 and 4.7). According to the lists, Burwell employed three overseers in 1782, and two in 1783, one of whom, John Ivory, seems to have lived on a separate quarter with a family of slaves. The others, Thomas Allen and John Bragg in 1782, and James Bailey in 1783 managed at the home plantation (see Appendix D). Unfortunately, the slaves are recorded in laundry-list fashion with no designation as to gender, relationship, or individual value; and yet some characteristics of his slave population can be derived from these lists.

Table 4.6 Lewis Burwell IV's moveable taxable property in 1782.

1782 Taxable Property List	Free White Men	Slaves	
		M	F
Group 1 (Ivory)	1	2	3
Group 2 (Allen)	1		
Group 3 (Burwell IV)	1	1	
Group 4 (Thacker's Estate)*		44	33
Group 5 (Bragg)			
Group 6 (Burwell V Slaves)*	1	31	25
Sub Total		78	61
Total	4	139	

* In 1782 and 1783 Lewis IV paid the taxes on two large groups of slaves that belonged in name only to his deceased son Thacker's estate, and to his son Lewis Burwell V.

Table 4.7. Lewis Burwell IV's moveable taxable property in 1783.

1783 Taxable Property List	Free White Men	Slaves			
		Adult (+16)		Child (-16)	
		M	F	M	F
Group 1 (Ivory)	1	1	1	1	3
Group 2 (Burwell V Slaves)	1	13	11	23	16
Group 3 (Burwell IV)	1	1			
Group 4 (Thacker's Estate)		20	19	21	18
Group 5 (Bailey)	1				
Sub Total		35	31	45	37
Total	4	148			

The 1782 list does not make a distinction between adults and children, whereas the 1783 list does (cf., Tables 4.6 and 4.7). A comparison of the two lists indicates that Burwell's slaves increased in number between 1782 and 1783, from 139 to 148, nearly 10 percent. The ratio of females to males remained almost the same between the two years, and the ratio of adult men and women in 1783 was nearly even at 112, right on par with demographic patterns statewide (Morgan 1998:82).

Between 1782 and 1783 Burwell's workforce remained relatively constant. Twelve names on the 1782 list are missing from the 1783 list. There is no compelling information that Lewis IV was selling off large numbers of slaves at this time, suggesting that most of the 12 had died, presumably infants or children.²⁶ Ten of the missing 12 were from among the slaves belonging to Lewis V. To put this figure into perspective, there was perhaps an annual attrition rate of approximately 10 percent for Burwell's slaves.

The 1783 tax list includes 22 additional or different names compared to the 1782 list. Four of the new slaves are listed as adults, and 18 as children. This would be an astounding birth rate if all 18 children were born to Burwell slaves in a 12-month period, meaning more than half of Burwell's adult women had given birth that year. In 1783 the ratio of children to adult women among Burwell slaves was 264 (more than 2.5 children per adult woman), an indication that they were producing children at a higher rate than the norm on Virginia plantations for this period, which was approximately 180 (see Morgan 1998:83).

²⁶ Two of the 12 appear to have been adults.

Another way to address the stability of the Lewis IV slave population is to compare the 29 names of the 1745 dower share slaves with the list of adults on the 1783 tax list. Six of the names (Lewis, Nan, Patience, Moll, Beck, and Sarah) can be found on both lists, although the names are generic enough that the actual person on each list may not be the same. The 1782 and 1783 tax lists also can be compared with baptismal records at Bruton Parish Church between 1747 and 1768. Most of the 73 baptisms that occurred for slaves belonging to Lewis IV were performed in infancy; fewer than 10 of his adult slaves chose to be baptized (Walsh 1997:157, 249-251). At least 42 of the baptized children can not be accounted for on the 1782 or 1783 lists, whereas 24 of the names correlated to an adult on the 1783 list. Although these numbers are not exact, this suggests that nearly two out of every three baptized slave children belonging to Lewis Burwell IV between 1747 and 1768 had been removed from the slave population, either by death, sale, or escape.

Given this apparent high rate of attrition and turnover, any chance for Burwell's slaves to establish long-term continuity within family groups was uncertain. Insecurity was a fact of life for the Burwell slaves, due in part to high child mortality rates, the threat of sale, and the possibility of shifts in re-staffing quarters. However, for the 30 years that Lewis IV operated Kingsmill/Utopia, the first two decades appeared to be relatively stable for slave families and households compared to the final decade of his tenure there. In the years between 1745 and 1765 the historical record reflects no major labor shifts on Burwell's plantations, no unusual management practices, and most importantly, relative financial stability which translated into social stability for Burwell's slaves (see Goodwin 1963:21-26, xxvii-xxxvi; Wells 1976:22-27; Kelso 1984:45-47).

However, the growth and development of Lewis IV's Mecklenburg County properties eventually became an issue of grave concern for all his slaves. As time passed, by the late 1760s Burwell increasingly turned his focus and interest to Mecklenburg, shuttled additional slaves west, and in the process ended up disrupting slave family stability and sometimes severing family members from each other.

Lewis IV was not alone in his desire to move west; he and several other tidewater Burwell family members set up plantations in the interior and relocated. The Burwells happened to be part of one of the first waves of westward migration, a swell of resettlement that began in earnest after the American Revolution, and crested in the first decades of the 19th century (see Walsh 1997:204-205; Berlin 2003:161-244). This vast course of westward migration caused tremendous upheaval among slave populations, to the extent that by the 19th century it functioned as an African-American Diaspora that some have argued was as significant in its breadth and scope as the transatlantic slave trade in the 18th century. It had such an overwhelming impact on virtually all aspects of slave culture that Ira Berlin labels it a "Second Middle Passage" (2003:161-163). Indeed, for some of Lewis Burwell IV's slaves the move to Mecklenburg County caused episodes of excruciating separation.

As Lewis IV made final preparations for his move west in 1774 and 1775, he began selling off slaves, or allowing the local sheriff to seize and auction off some of his entailed slaves to repay his creditors, a procedure that benefited him (Walsh 1997:211). As separations occurred with more frequency, an increasing number of Burwell's slaves ran away, in almost all cases in an attempt to reunite with family members (ibid.:213-214). Walsh (ibid.:213) notes that the more than 20 runaway advertisements placed by

various tidewater Burwells in the *Virginia Gazette* in the 1770s was “an extraordinary number,” and probably there were others that were caught quickly before an ad was placed in the newspaper. Between 1767 and 1779 there are ten runaway slaves mentioned in regard to Lewis Burwell IV in various *Virginia Gazette* advertisements (ibid.:213-214). These ten adults amounted to approximately 15 percent of his total adult slave population at the time, or perhaps one member of each extended family that had once lived together at Kingsmill/Utopia. It is a cruel irony that Lewis IV’s 1784 obituary cited his “tenderness to his slaves” as one of his “duties of the first necessity,” a characteristic that many might have questioned as they witnessed their loved ones sold off (see Goodwin 1963:xxxvi; Walsh 1997:214).

Compared to the Bray plantation records, the existing documentation for Lewis Burwell IV pertaining specifically to Utopia is a bit thin. It appears that for the first two decades, between 1745 and ca. 1765 the conditions for families and households among the Kingsmill/Utopia slaves were relatively stable. Since Lewis IV was restricted by entail from dramatically changing the workforce at Kingsmill, but not so at Utopia, it is possible that he used Utopia as a staging ground for various work crews. At the very least, the social continuity of Utopia under Burwell may have been more fluid than his other Kingsmill holdings. Nonetheless, for the first 20 years of Lewis IV’s ownership of Kingsmill/Utopia (1745 – ca. 1765) the membership of his workforce at the home plantation and on outlying quarters like Utopia remained fairly constant and the climate for family and household growth was better than most plantations in the area. In fact, given the general emergence in the third quarter of the 18th century of a more conciliatory style of plantation management among the larger slave holders such as Lewis

Burwell IV, coupled with a decline in the flow of new African slaves onto the plantations and the extraordinary natural increase of slave communities, the years 1745 to 1765 during Period 4 at Utopia represent a high water mark for family development.

The surviving documentary evidence indicate that household and family growth at Kingsmill/Utopia largely was due to outside forces—demographic trends, slowing of the transatlantic slave trade, economic consistency—not because Lewis IV's ultimate objective was to promote family and household stability among his slaves. The ability for slaves living at Utopia to create some semblance of family largely depended on the size of the group in residence and the length of time most of those members resided together. In the 1760s nearly two out of every three Virginia slaves lived in units of 11 or more people, and one of every three slaves lived in units larger than 20 people, a substantial increase in the size of average slave quarter from twenty years earlier (Morgan 1998:41). Stability benefited both parties: slaves naturally wanted the security of living with supportive friends and loved ones, and owners found these types of groups were easier to manage and more productive. An interpretation of the available documents illustrates that many of the Burwell slaves lived in family groups, and husbands and wives had opportunities to cohabitate together and raise children under the same roof.

If the first 20 years of Burwell ownership at Utopia represents the height of family development at the quarter, the following decade between ca. 1765 and 1775 represents a low point. When Burwell began the process of relocating to Mecklenburg County in the mid 1760s and as the move approached in the 1770s, slave family and household stability changed drastically. Lewis IV did not hesitate to sell off slaves for his financial and

logistical benefit, actively sought out ways to circumvent the entail on Kingsmill, and dismantled many of the family groups that had developed at Kingsmill/Utopia for at least a generation. The documents are inconclusive, but it probably is not an exaggeration to suggest that every slave family owned by Lewis IV suffered the separation of at least one parent, one child, sibling or a spouse during this period. Thus, it was the best of times and then the worst of times for slave families at Utopia under Lewis Burwell IV. Twenty years of seemingly stable family growth was shattered within a few years in the 1770s, a dismantling that signaled the final demise of the Utopia Quarter after a century of activity.

Figure 4.1. Conjectural reconstruction of the layout of the 1,200-acre Littleton/Utopia plantation.

Figure 4.1. Conjectural reconstruction of the layout of the 1,280-acre Littleton/Utopia plantation (U.S.G.S. Hog Island 1984).

Figure 4.2. Location of James Bray II's holdings in the vicinity of Utopia (U.S.G.S. Hog Island 1984).

Figure 4.2. Location of James Bray II's holdings in the vicinity of Utopia (U.S.G.S. Hog Island 1984).

Figure 4.3. Owners of property in the vicinity of Utopia ca. 1751 (U.S.G.S. Hog Island 1984).

Figure 4.4. *Plan du débarquement et la Marche de la division Commandee par le Mr. de Simon* (Anonymous 1781).

Figure 4.5. *Carte de la campagne faite en Virginie en 1781* (Pechon 1781).

Figure 4.5. Carte des Environs de Williamsburg en Virginie (Desandrouin 1781).

Figure 4.5. Carte de la compagnie faite en Virginie en 1781 (Pechon 1781).

Figure 4.6. *Carte des Environs de Williamsburg en Virginie* (Desandrouin 1781).

CHAPTER V.

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AT THE UTOPIA QUARTER

The combined use of archaeological and documentary materials should permit us to say something about the past that could not have been said using only one set of data.

James Deetz (1996:32)

Archaeology requires that we see and understand, and it has been demonstrated time and again that what we do not understand we do not really see.

Ivor Noël Hume (1969:17)

As the excavation of the Utopia Quarter progressed it became apparent that the site did not consist of a single habitation episode, but rather four successive groups occupied the site, each living in separate houses and producing their own distinctive archaeological imprint. The entire span of these four occupation phases is bracketed within a 100 year period, ca. 1675 to ca. 1775, and each appears to have lasted no more than 25 to 30 years, roughly a generation. Thus, for analytical purposes the only valid analytical approach is to treat the Utopia Quarter as four discrete sites, each with a story to tell. There is a fifth context as well, a small burial ground possibly associated with two of the occupation periods.

Because each of the five contexts largely functioned without reference to any of the others coming before or after it, there is little reason to analyze the site as a whole; for example, mean ceramic dates, clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas, and other such techniques would produce information of almost no value. However, I employed a similar methodological approach to each of Utopia's five "sites." Aside from some artifacts excavated in the 1970s that primarily relate to Period 1, all the artifacts collected in the 1990s are readily comparable with each other.¹

¹ The majority of artifacts pertaining to the Period 1 occupation were excavated in the 1970s, and the assemblage has not been fully quantified. For example, sherd counts are not available for much of the

Excavations at Utopia spanning its 100 years of occupation have produced a total of 158 features or macro-features² of varying sizes and complexity, and more than 96,000 artifacts (Table 5.1). Sub-floor pits comprised the single most prevalent feature type at Utopia, making up more than 40 percent of the total features at the site. A group of 25 human burials were the second most common feature type, followed by 17 miscellaneous features (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1. Historic features related to activity at the Utopia Quarter.

Structures	Sub-Floor Pits	Trash Pits	Borrow Pits	Misc. Pit Features	Human Burials	Fences	Ditches/Trenches	Cellars/Wells	Misc. Features	Total
12 8%	64 41%	13 8%	3 2%	13 8%	25 16%	4 3%	5 3%	2 1%	17 11%	158

Of the four occupation periods and the burial ground, Period 4 yielded the highest number of features, due to the 24 sub-floor pits and 11 major trash or borrow pits in the yard (Table 5.2). It is interesting to note that the amount of features increased over time from a low of 20 for Period 1 to a high of 46 for Period 4. This trend may be attributable to population size: a larger group of people presumably had more opportunities and a greater need to create archaeological features. However, I believe the main factor contributing to feature density was the duration of each occupation. For example, Period 1 may have been active for as few as 15 years, whereas activity at Period 4 appears to

ceramic collection. However, for some complete items such as hoes, pairs of scissors, table knives, etc. counts can be determined which allow for comparison with the findings from the 1990s (see Fesler 2000).

² Macro-features are comprised of interrelated groups of features such as the postholes that form a post-in-ground structure or the postholes that form a post-and-rail fence.

have spanned twice as long, as much as 30 years, seemingly explaining why Period 4 produced more than double the amount features at Period 1.

Table 5.2. Historic features related to activity at the Utopia Quarter, by period.

	Period 1	Period 2	Burial Ground	Period 3	Period 4
Structures	2	4		3	3
Sub-Floor Pits		19		21	24
Trash Pits	1			4	8
Borrow Pits					3
Misc. Pit Features	2	5		6	
Human Burials			25		
Fences	2	1		1	
Ditches/Trenches	4			1	
Cellars/Wells	2				
Misc. Features	7	2			8
Total	20	31	25	36	46

Contrary to differences in feature density for each occupation period, duration of occupancy does not appear to explain why Period 2 produced the most artifacts and Period 4 the least (Table 5.3).³ Post-depositional activities may have had some effect on the presence or absence of artifacts within each of the occupation periods.⁴ However, different excavation methods were employed at Period 4, and this is the most likely cause of any dramatic variation in the amount of artifacts collected from each occupation period (see Table 5.3). All of the soils from sub-floor pits (and some major features) in Periods 1, 2, and 3 was collected and subjected to flotation analysis, which captured small artifacts that otherwise would be lost. At the Period 4 site archaeologists collected a 50-liter sample from each context within each large sub-floor pit, and screened the remaining

³ Period 1 contains only the 1,749 artifacts excavated in the 1990s. After examining the collection, I estimate that it numbers less than 10,000 artifacts (see Fesler 2000).

⁴ The property once functioned as an Army base known as Camp Wallace between World War I and the 1960s and various activities impacted portions of Utopia.

fill through 1/4" hardware cloth. Flotation generated more than half the total artifacts from Period 2, whereas roughly 30 percent of the Period 3 and 4 artifacts were collected by the flotation process (see Table 5.3). By factoring out the artifacts recovered by flotation, the assemblages for Periods 2, 3, and 4 are comparable in size, suggesting that the differing excavation methodologies accounted for the differences in the assemblages (see Table 5.3).

Table 5.3. Artifact totals from the Utopia Quarter, per occupation period.

	Period 1	Period 2	Burial Ground	Period 3	Period 4	Other Artifacts*	Totals
Total Artifacts	1,748	29,764	2,588	21,466	19,040	21,644	96,250
Flotation Artifacts	263	15,278	0	5,854	6,031	--	27,426
% from Flotation	15%	51%	0	27%	32%	--	28%
Total Artifacts w/o Float	1,485	14,486	2,588	15,612	13,009	--	47,180

*Includes findings from modern features, test units, and shovel test holes not incorporated into any further analysis.

Archaeology of Period 1 Utopia, ca. 1675-1700

The archaeological components related to the Period 1 occupation of Utopia consisted of 20 discrete features or macro-features, ranging from small indeterminate pits or holes to a large dwelling house with a half cellar and a brick-lined well (Figure 5.1; Table 5.4). Most of the features were excavated in their entirety or sampled. Of those, the half cellar and the well contained the vast majority of the artifacts, somewhere in the area of 80 to 90 percent of them.⁵

⁵ A detailed account of all the findings from Period 1 Utopia can be found in Kelso (1976; 1984) and Fesler (2000).

Table 5.4. Historic features associated with Period 1 occupation at Utopia.

Type of Feature	N	Field Numbers	Description
Structures	2	KM306/KM308,	Main dwelling house
		FE70	Barn/tobacco house
Half Cellar	1	KM300-KM303	Half cellar under main dwelling house
Well	1	KM309-KM312	Excavated to a depth of 66'
"Collection Basin"	1	KM315	Water collection basin possibly used to water stock
Trash Pit	1	FE93	3.3' by 4.9' trash-filled pit
Circular Pit	1	FE142*	10' by 11' pit, not tested
Fence and Ditch Enclosure	1	KM324	Fence and ditch parallel each other and enclose south yard
	1	KM314/KM321/FE92	
Fence	1	FE141*	Extends 35' east of main house
Ditches/Trenches	1	FE138*	Possibly modern, length unknown
	1	FE139*	48' exposed, length unknown, drains east down slope
	1	FE140*	25' exposed, length unknown, drains east down slope
Misc. or Unidentifiable Features	7	KM313	Mostly small unidentifiable features
		KM317	
		KM318	
		KM320	
		KM322	
		KM323	
		FE94	
Total	20		

* not excavated or tested

Builders used post-in-ground architecture to erect both the main dwelling house and a nearby outbuilding. The main house was set on eight main structural posts to form a core 18' by 29' in size. Half bays extended off each gable end to serve as chimneys or small rooms to make its total size 18' by 38' (Figure 5.2). Under the floor on the west end of the house a 12.5' by 15' brick-lined half cellar with an exterior bulkhead entrance was later added (Figures 5.3 and 5.4). A second structure was located roughly 130' south

from the main dwelling, perched within a few paces of the eroding edge of a steep bank (see Figure 5.1). Probably functioning as a barn or tobacco drying house, this second building proved to have the same dimensions as the core of the main dwelling house, 18' by 29', and was oriented on the same compass axis.

A series of ditches and a post-and-rail fence divided the yard between the main house and the outbuilding, creating an inner yard around the main house (see Figure 5.1). A portion of the main ditch drained into a square "collection basin," perhaps used to water livestock. Other ditches extended east from the main house down a slope, as well as a section of post-and-rail fence tied into the middle gable post. In the corner of the inner yard, approximately 70' southwest from the main house, the residents used a 5' wide brick-lined well to obtain fresh water. Archaeological excavation of the well was terminated at a depth of 67' due to hazardous conditions (Figures 5.5 and 5.6).

In addition to the structures, fencing and ditching, and the well, archaeologists encountered two pit features of note. A 3.3' by 4.9' oval-shaped trash pit was located only a few feet south from the eroded edge of the well (see Figure 5.1) and produced over 1,000 artifacts, some of the earliest dated material at the site (Figures 5.7 and 5.8). A large circular pit located on the side slope of the site to the northeast of the main dwelling house was not tested. The remainder of the minor features produced few artifacts and added no significant information to the understanding of the site.

The exact number of artifacts attributable to the Period 1 occupation cannot be determined.⁶ The collection has drawn the attention of researchers who have studied the

⁶ The 1970s artifact catalogue lists the presence of artifact types within each context, but the original artifact counts have been lost. No attempt was made here to re-catalogue or quantify the 1970s finds.

ceramics (Outlaw et al. 1977; Yentsch 1990; 1991a), the faunal remains (Miller 1978), and the colonoware pottery (Ferguson 1992).

Archaeologists have developed various techniques to pinpoint when a site was occupied and for how long. Most of the dating methods focus on clay tobacco pipes and ceramics. At least four formulas have been developed to determine a mean date from clay tobacco pipes (see Harrington 1954; Noël Hume 1969:296-307). Three of the formulas work on the premise that the bore diameter of English clay pipes diminished in size over time (see Binford 1962a; Hanson 1969; Heighton and Deagan 1971).⁷ Another formula examines the change in pipebowl shape over time to determine a mean date (Mallios 2000). All four formulas were applied to the 268 available English pipestem fragments, and all produced a date within the range of time between the early 1670s and the late 1690s (Table 5.5). The average of the various mean dates provides a cumulative mean date of 1683, at what I believe is the approximate midpoint of the site's occupation.

By creating histograms of a site's English pipestem bore diameters derived from historical archaeologist J.C. Harrington's early work with them, James Deetz developed a comparative method of observing the duration of an occupation (1987). In general, histograms with a high peak indicate a shorter period of occupancy, while flatter more level histograms suggest a longer occupation span, long enough for the bore diameter of the pipestems to grow smaller (Deetz 1987; see also Edwards and Brown 1993). Deetz suggested that differences in histogram profiles that he witnessed on a group of sites at Flowerdew Hundred plantation in Prince George County, Virginia, reflected broad

⁷ One of the drawbacks of formulas based on pipestem bore diameters is sample size. To ensure accuracy it has been argued that a sample must contain 900 or more specimens (Noël Hume 1970:300-301), although relatively accurate dates have been obtained with fewer.

Table 5.5. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 1 Utopia.

Tobacco Pipe Test					Date
Binford Pipestem Formula ^a					1673
Hanson Pipestem Formula ^b					1674
Heighton/Deagan Pipestem Formula ^c					1690
Mallios Bowl Formula ^d					1693
Mallios Formula w/o Type 26A ^d					1685
Average of the Five Formulas					1683
Bore Diameter	5/64"	6/64"	7/64"	8/64"	Total
Count	2	99	128	39	268
Percent	<1%	37%	48%	15%	
Product	10	594	896	312	1812
1812/268 = 6.761					

$$^a Y = 1931.85 - 38.26(6.761) \quad Y = 1673$$

$$^b Y = 1869.31 - 28.88(6.761) \quad Y = 1674$$

$$^c X = (-\log [6.761] + 1.04435) / .05234 = 4.0951 * 22 = 90 + 1600 = 1690$$

$$^d (\text{Type 8}=1*1655, \text{Type 10}=1*1665, \text{Type 12}=5*1665, \text{Type 13}=3*1695, \text{Type 17}=12*1695, \text{Type 18}=2*1770) = 40620/24 = 1693; \text{without Type 26A: } 37080/22 = 1685$$

economic changes in tobacco agriculture that influenced the duration of occupation over time (Deetz 1987:65-66). The strength of placing pipestem data into these types of histograms is the ability to compare the profiles with other sites. Alone, a single histogram like that for Period 1 Utopia is not as informative (Figure 5.9). Nonetheless, the pipestem histogram for Period 1 Utopia does suggest that activity at the site spanned from 1650 to 1710, with close to half the pipestems falling within the 1650 to 1680 time period and more than one-third in the 1680-1710 time span (see Figure 5.9). From this, a peak of activity at the site can be interpreted in the 1670s and 1680s, with a drop off in the 1690s.

A mean date cannot be established for Period 1 Utopia from the ceramics because the number of sherds has not been determined. However, by charting the production time span of each ceramic type recovered from the site an estimated duration of occupation

can be determined (see South 1977:214-217). Such a chart was produced in the 1970s and established a bracket of activity at the site that spanned from 1670 to 1700, with a median date of 1691 (Figure 5.10). Given new data extracted from Period 1 features in the 1990s, and given a refined understanding of many of the ceramic typologies, updated date range charts have been made (Figures 5.11 and 5.12). Figure 5.11 charts all dateable ceramics recovered from Period 1 features and provides a skewed date range of 1700-1745. Some of the upper well layers which had intrusive artifacts from later activity are removed for Figure 5.12, which more accurately places the date of activity within a window between 1680 and 1700.

Based on all the dating mechanisms for Period 1, most of the computed dates fall within the ownership period of Thomas Pettus II (Figure 5.13). Enough of the mean dates congregate around 1690 to suggest that activity of some sort continued at the site during the 1690s.

Summary of the History and Archaeology of Period 1 (ca. 1675 – 1700)

Thomas Pettus II established the Utopia Quarter in the mid 1670s by building two 18' by 29' post-in-ground structures on the site, one to serve as a dwelling house, the other as a tobacco barn. A brick-lined half cellar was later added to the house and expanded on each end; the yard was fenced on several sides and included a well and a livestock watering basin (see Figure 5.1). Slaves and servants occupied the site until 1690 when Pettus II died. For the next several years the site may have been occupied by tenants until the main house burned down before the year 1700 (see Figure 5.13).

It is possible that two cohabitating slave couples, one with a son, lived at Utopia during Pettus II's tenure. If so, these small slave families shared space in the main house

with indentured servants. In fact, all the residents of the quarter at the time lived under one roof, forming by necessity a coresidential group that may or may not have functioned cooperatively as a household. The outlook for slave family development in the region at the time was changing rapidly, but at Utopia the growing group of slaves may have discovered a window of opportunity to establish families.

Archaeology of Period 2 Utopia, 1700 – ca. 1730

The archaeological components related to the Period 2 occupation of Utopia consisted of 31 features or macro-features. The macro-features included four post-in-ground structures, and a post-and-rail fence connecting two of the structures. The majority of individual features—19 of them—pertained to sub-floor pits (Figure 5.14; Table 5.6). The sub-floor pits ranged from a small circular pit (FE30) only 18” in diameter in Structure 1 to a large 6.0’ by 6.0’ square sub-floor pit in Structure 10 that was modified and re-dug several times (Figure 5.15). All of the features were excavated in their entirety and produced nearly 30,000 artifacts.

Like Period 1, the carpenters framed the four Period 2 buildings on posts, as per the most popular form of vernacular architecture of the period (see Carson et al. 1981). Structures 1, 10, and 20 served as housing units, while Structure KM307 was used as an outbuilding. Structures 1 and 20 both were 12’ by 28’ in size. Structure 1 contained six sub-floor pits, most of them positioned at one end of the building around a dry-laid brick hearth. The only interior feature inside Structure 20 was a large sub-floor pit positioned in the southwest corner of the building, most likely fronting a fireplace. Structure 10 was the largest of the three housing units with dimensions of 16’ by 32’ with an attached shed. Structure 10 had a large sub-floor pit complex fronting a fireplace on its west end,

Table 5.6. Historic features associated with Period 2 occupation at Utopia.

Type of Feature	N	Field Numbers	Description
Structures	4	FE1, FE10, FE20, KM307	Three dwellings and one outbuilding
Hall Sub-floor pits	9	FE2, FE3, FE4, FE21, FE30, FE35, FE36, FE36T, FE37	Sub-floor pits fronting gable end fireplaces in the hall
Parlor Sub-floor pits	10	FE5, FE6, FE9, FE14, FE15, FE16, FE17, FE18, FE27, FE32	Sub-floor pits located in the parlor of structures
Hearth Base	1	FE13	Dry-laid hearth in Structure 1
Hearth Debris	1	FE19	Brick and debris area in Structure 10
Circular Pit	1	FE28	Circular pit located north from Structure 20
Cooking Pit	1	FE133	Possible cooking pit in courtyard
Fence Enclosure	1	FE114	Fence posts connecting Structure 10 and 20
Pit or Post	1	FE29	Indeterminate pit feature
Small Pits	2	FE134 and FE135	Possible small pit features
Total	31		

while the east half of the building contained eight pits arrayed along the walls of the room. The fourth structure, a 12' by 16' outbuilding (KM307) with no internal features, was located to the south of Structure 20 (see Figure 5.14).

The buildings were positioned in such a way as to form an open area courtyard in the center (Figure 5.16). A post-and-rail fence tied Structure 10 to Structure 20 to form a small enclosure (see Figure 5.14). Otherwise, archaeologists excavated a hearth-related feature in Structures 1 and 10, and five pit features of varying sizes in the yard. Feature 28 was a large circular pit approximately 6' in diameter that appeared to be the top of a well shaft. However, excavation proved that it was only 4' deep, perhaps evidence of an aborted well. FE133 was located in the courtyard outside Structure 1 and served as a small cooking pit (see Figure 5.14).

The four pipestem dating formulas were applied to 347 measurable English pipestem fragments and to the identifiable bowl types from Period 2 (Table 5.7). Only two of the formulas produced mean dates within the ownership period of James Bray II, and the average of the various dates provides a cumulative mean date of 1731. It is possible that the mean dates just happen to be weighted to the 1730s, or pipestem and bowl dates may indicate that activity continued at the site for several years after James II died in 1725, a likely scenario considering that James II entailed the Littleton/Utopia plantation so his heirs could continue the operation without a slowdown.

Table 5.7. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 2 Utopia.

Tobacco Pipe Test						Date
Binford Pipestem Formula ^a						1733
Hanson Pipestem Formula ^b						1724
Heighton/Deagan Pipestem Formula ^c						1738
Mallios Bowl Formula ^d						1742
Mallios Formula w/o Type 26A ^d						1720
Average of the Five Formulas						1731
Bore Diameter	4/64"	5/64"	6/64"	7/64"	8/64"	Total
Count	19	258	58	8	4	347
Percent	6%	74%	17%	2%	1%	
Product	76	1290	348	56	32	1802
1802/347 = 5.193						

$$^a Y = 1931.85 - 38.26(5.193) \quad Y = 1733$$

$$^b Y = 1894.88 - 32.98(5.193) \quad Y = 1724$$

$$^c X = (-\log [5.193] + 1.04435) / .05234 = 6.2845 * 22 = 138 + 1600 = 1738$$

$$^d (\text{Type 26A}=20*1770, \text{Type 21A}=2*1695, \text{Type 25A}=12*1735, \text{Type 21C}=4*1695, \text{Type 21B}=1*1695, \text{Type 24}=6*1720) = 78405/45 = 1742; \text{Without Type 26A: } 43005/25 = 1720$$

The pipestem histogram suggests that most of the activity at the site took place between 1710 and 1750, with almost 75 percent of the pipestems falling within that time span (Figure 5.17). With 17 percent of the remaining pipestems within the 1680 to 1710 range, this tilts the occupation span toward 1710, probably indicating that activity began

at the site shortly prior to 1710 in the first decade of the 18th century. Thus, the histogram for Period 2 suggests a period of occupation between 1700 and 1730, largely during the ownership of James Bray II.

The Period 2 occupation yielded a relatively small quantity of ceramic sherds. From sealed contexts, only 132 fragments could be identified as to manufacture type. Nonetheless, the sherds produced a mean ceramic date of 1718 (Table 5.8). Supposing that 1718 represents a midpoint of occupation, one can surmise that if the site was occupied for roughly a generation (20 years), that activity began around 1708 and ended around 1728.

Table 5.8. Mean date for identifiable Period 2 Utopia ceramic sherds.

Ceramic Type	Sherds	Mean Date	Sum
Coarseware unidentified	4	1750	7000
Buckley Coarseware	8	1727.5	13820
Challis Coarseware	2	1705	3410
North Devon Coarseware	1	1687.5	1687.5
Pennsylvania Coarseware	1	1790	1790
Staffordshire Mottled Glaze Coarseware	2	1730	3460
Yorktown Coarseware	2	1735	3470
Colonoware	57	1722.5	98182.5
Delft all kinds	27	1700	45900
Staffordshire Slipware	1	1727.5	1727.5
English Brown Stoneware	12	1732.5	20790
Burslem Stoneware	1	1732.5	1732.5
Nottingham Stoneware	1	1747.5	1747.5
English White Salt Glaze Stoneware	1	1747.5	1747.5
Frechen Stoneware	6	1650	9900
Westerwald Stoneware	1	1687.5	1687.5
Yorktown Stoneware	5	1732.5	8662.5
Totals	132		226715
Mean Ceramic Date			1717.538

The length of occupation inferred from the mean ceramic date can be checked against a chart of the production time spans for each ceramic type recovered from Period

2 (see South 1977:214-217). Figure 5.18 charts all dateable ceramics recovered from sealed contexts related to Period 2 and provides a date range of 1700 to 1740. The date range can be refined by eliminating one potentially intrusive fragment of Pennsylvania coarseware (Figure 5.19). Without the Pennsylvania coarseware, the window of activity at the site is narrowed to 1700 to 1720 (see Figure 5.19).

Based on all the various dating techniques, cumulatively they suggest that activity began at Period 2 Utopia in the first decade of the 18th century after James Bray II acquired the property in 1700 (Figure 5.20). Although most of the tobacco pipestem and bowl dates are massed in the 1730s, other indicators suggest activity ceased at the site by 1730, probably not long after James II died in 1725.

Summary of the History and Archaeology of Period 2 (1700 – ca. 1730)

James Bray II acquired Utopia in 1700 and within the next ten years erected three housing units and an outbuilding arranged in a compound around an open courtyard space in the center (see Figure 5.14). Each of the housing units contained between one and a dozen sub-floor pits. Activity at the quarter continued even after James II died in 1725, and may have extended up to or slightly beyond 1730, meaning the site was occupied for between 20 and 30 years (see Figure 5.20).

The existing documentation indicates that conditions for slave family development during James II's ownership of the Utopia Quarter were relatively good. By 1725 Bray owned an almost even number of men and women at Littleton/Utopia, and a small number of children were present as well. And given the fact that one of their own, either Debb or Jacko, was in charge, this may have given the residents of Utopia a

modicum of autonomy to organize themselves into coresidential groups and households of their choosing.

Archaeology of Period 3 Utopia, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750

Period 3 Utopia consisted of 36 features or macro-features (Figure 5.21; Table 5.9). The macro-features included three post-in-ground structures, a post-and-rail fence, and a paling ditch enclosure connected to Structure 40. A total of 21 of the individual features were sub-floor pits, three in Structure 40 and 18 in Structure 50 (Figures 5.22 and 5.23). Enormous trash pit complexes were located adjacent to both of the housing units (Figures 5.24 and 5.25). Although all of the Period 3 features were excavated in their entirety or sampled, the sub-floor pits and trash pits produced most of the 21,500 artifacts.

Table 5.9. Historic features associated with Period 3 occupation at Utopia.

Type of Feature	N	Field Numbers	Description
Structures	3	FE40, FE50, FE107	Two housing units and one small outbuilding
Hall Sub-floor pits	15	FE41, FE42, FE43, FE45, FE48, FE51, FE52, FE53, FE54, FE55, FE56, FE57, FE58C/E, FE58B, FE58D	Sub-floor pits in the hall in Structures 40 and 50
Parlor Sub-floor Pits	6	FE39A, FE39B, FE44, FE46, FE47, FE49	Sub-floor pits located in the parlors of Structure 50
Trash Pits	4	FE61 (and FE97), FE62, FE119, FE127	Trash pits associated with Structures 40 and 50
Fence Enclosure	1	FE126	Paling ditch enclosure connected to Structure 40
Fence	1	FE105	Post-and-rail fence near Str. 50
Pit Features	6	FE64, FE113, FE122, FE123, FE130, FE136	Various miscellaneous pit features
Total	36		

Like Periods 1 and 2, the carpenters used post-in-ground architecture to build all three Period 3 structures (see Carson et al. 1981). Structures 40 and 50 were used as housing units and Structure 107 was a small 10' by 10' outbuilding probably used for agricultural storage, perhaps corn or fodder. Structure 40 was 12' by 16' in size and contained three centrally located sub-floor pits that had been partially disturbed in recent years, causing them to have a non-linear appearance on the surface (see Figure 5.22). A paling ditch enclosure formed a private yard behind Structure 40, and a large trash pit complex was located immediately outside the enclosure, filled with trash and debris from the housing unit (see Figure 5.21).

Structure 50 was built in stages. The original core of the structure was identical in size to Structure 40, 12' by 16'. At a later date two 6' by 16' sheds were added to each side of the main core to form a structure 16' by 24' in size (see Figure 5.21). Eighteen sub-floor pits were arrayed throughout the interior of Structure 50, many cutting through one another, evidence of repeated episodes of filling and re-digging (see Figure 5.23). A very large trash pit was located within a few paces of Structure 50, used exclusively by the residents living in the building (see Figure 5.25).

The area between Structures 40 and 50 was largely open aside from Structure 107, the small outbuilding (see Figure 5.21). This space between the main housing units could have formed a communal area similar to the courtyard in Period 2, but this time less formally bounded. A post-and-rail fence formed a north boundary near Structure 50, while the enclosure on the back of Structure 40 demarcated a restricted zone that could be entered through a gate next the building (see Figure 5.21). Otherwise, the yard between Structure 40 and Structure 50 was unobstructed and apparently open to all.

Pipestem dating formulas were applied to 599 measurable English pipestem fragments and to 66 identifiable bowl types from Period 3 (Table 5.10). The Hanson and Mallios formulas produced dates of 1744, and a modified Mallios pipebowl date yielded a mean date of 1732, all within the Thomas Bray II or James Bray III periods of ownership. The Binford and Heighton/Deagan formulas yielded dates in the 1750s or early 1760s. The average of all five dating formulas produced a date of 1746, only two years removed from the James Bray III era. The skewing of the pipestem and bowl dates toward the middle 1740s suggests that activity continued at the site after James Bray III died in 1744 (Figure 5.26). In fact, there is no reason to suggest that the site was abandoned at his death. Utopia passed into the hands of Bray's widow and her new husband Lewis Burwell IV only a few months after Bray died, and evidence indicates

Table 5.10. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 3 Utopia.

Tobacco Pipe Test						Date
Binford Pipestem Formula ^a						1757
Hanson Pipestem Formula ^b						1744
Heighton/Deagan Pipestem Formula ^c						1762
Mallios Bowl Formula ^d						1744
Mallios Formula w/o Type 26A ^d						1732
Average of the Five Formulas						1746
Bore Diameter	4/64"	5/64"	6/64"	7/64"	8/64"	Total
Count	267	326	4	1	1	599
Percent	45%	54%	1%	<1%	<1%	
Product	1068	1630	24	7	8	2737
2737/599 = 4.569						

$$^a Y = 1931.85 - 38.26(4.569) \quad Y = 1757$$

$$^b Y = 1894.88 - 32.98(4.569) \quad Y = 1744$$

$$^c X = (-\log [4.569] + 1.04435) / .05234 = 7.3467 * 22 = 162 + 1600 = 1762$$

$$^d (\text{Type 26A} = 20 * 1770, \text{Type 25 or 25A} = 43 * 1735, \text{Type 13} = 1 * 1670, \text{Type 12E} = 1 * 1665, \text{Type 25B} = 1 * 1750) = 115090/66 = 1744; \text{Without Type 26A: } 79690/46 = 1732$$

that the Burwells continued to operate Utopia with the same overseer, John Green, and probably with many, if not all, of the same slaves (McClure 1977:42-43).

The Period 3 pipestem histogram provides additional evidence that activity continued at the site into the 1750s (Figure 5.27). With 54 percent of the pipestems grouped into 1710 to 1750 period, and 45 percent within the 1750 to 1780 period, the histogram has a decided lean toward the 1750s and 1760s. A possible interpretation of the pipestem and bowl formulas and the histogram is that James Bray III built the Period 3 housing units in the early to mid 1730s when he took over ownership of the property, or shortly before by Thomas Bray II. Activity came to a halt in the late 1750s or perhaps early 1760s when Lewis Burwell IV owned the property (see Figure 5.26).

The mean ceramic date derived from 1,681 ceramic sherds recovered from Period 3 sealed contexts is 1723, and does not support the pipestem and bowl data (Table 5.11). The mean ceramic date likely is skewed by the inclusion of several ceramic types such as delftware (1600-1800), North Devon coarseware and Westerwald stoneware (1600-1775), that have long manufacturing time spans and place their mean date in the 17th century. With these three ceramic types removed from the equation, the adjusted mean ceramic date becomes 1734.

Because of the inherent flaws of the mean ceramic date formula, a chart of the intersecting production spans of all the Period 3 ceramic types may provide a more accurate depiction of the length of activity during Period 3 (see South 1977:214-217).

Figure 5.28 portrays all dateable ceramics recovered from sealed contexts related to Period 3 and indicates a date range of 1640-1740. This ceramic date range misrepresents the actual period of activity due to two intrusive, redeposited ceramic sherds. By

Table 5.11. Mean date for identifiable Period 3 Utopia ceramic sherds.

Ceramic Type	Sherds	Mean Date	Sum
Coarseware unidentified	4	1750	7000
Buckley Coarseware	22	1727.5	38005
North Devon Coarseware	121	1687.5	204187.5
Pennsylvania Coarseware	9	1790	16110
Staffordshire Coarseware	6	1690	10140
Staffordshire Iron Glaze Coarseware	1	1710	1710
Staffordshire Mottled Glaze Coarseware	1	1730	1730
Staffordshire North Midlands Coarseware	1	1620	1620
Wareham type Coarseware	4	1650	6600
Yorktown Coarseware	826	1735	1433110
Colonoware	119	1722.5	204977.5
Delft all kinds	246	1700	418200
Staffordshire Combed Slipware	6	1727.5	10365
Staffordshire Slipware	13	1727.5	22457.5
Staffordshire Dot Slipware	2	1737.5	3475
Staffordshire Mottled Over Slipware	3	1690	5070
Staffordshire Reverse Slipware	2	1727.5	3455
English Brown Stoneware	9	1732.5	15592.5
White Salt Glazed Slip Dipped Stoneware	6	1745	10470
Nottingham Stoneware	10	1747.5	17475
White Salt Glazed Stoneware	44	1747.5	76890
Frechen Stoneware	1	1650	1650
Westerwald Stoneware	104	1687.5	175500
Chinese Porcelain	7	1750	12250
Chinese Porcelain Under Glazed	8	1750	14000
Yorktown Stoneware	106	1732.5	183645
Totals	1681		2895685
Mean Ceramic Date			1722.597

eliminating a single fragment of Staffordshire North Midlands coarseware and a fragment of Frechen stoneware, the range of ceramic type production intersects at the year 1740, the midpoint of James Bray III's ownership of the property (Figure 5.29).

It is worth noting that four dateable coins were recovered from Period 3 features. Three coins, all heavily worn, were recovered from sub-floor pits in Structure 50 and dated between 1701 and 1729. One of the sub-floor pits in Structure 40 also yielded a

worn coin dated 1721. A wine bottle seal with the initial "TJBRA Y" for Thomas and James Bray III was found in a sub-floor pit in Structure 50. The coins suggest a date of deposition in the 1740s or 1750s, and the bottle seal provides an indisputable link to Thomas and James Bray III.

Cumulatively the dating formulas applied to Period 3 indicate a median date of activity in 1740, with a continuation of activity at the site into the 1750s (see Figure 5.26). From this it can be inferred that Structures 40 and 50 were built in the 1730s, perhaps by James Bray III when he took ownership of Utopia in 1736, but more likely by his father Thomas Bray II a few years earlier. Thomas Bray may have been motivated to build because of the destruction or deterioration of the Period 2 quarters located a short distance to the south from Period 3 (see Figure 1.10). The expansion of Structure 50 to double its original size probably was in response to the introduction of more slaves to the site. Presumably Thomas Bray II introduced newly purchased African slaves in the middle to late 1730s as part of his sale of some of the entailed land that he and his son had inherited from James Bray II. Structure 50 also could have been expanded by James Bray III after 1736 as part of his re-staffing of the quarter. When Lewis Burwell IV claimed ownership of Utopia in 1745, the archaeological findings strongly suggest that Period 3 Utopia continued to operate with no interruption into the 1750s. Thus, Period 3 seems to have spanned three owners, from its beginning with Thomas Bray II in the first half of the 1730s, through James Bray III between 1736 and 1744, to Lewis Burwell IV in the late 1740s and 1750s.

Summary of the History and Archaeology of Period 3 (ca. 1730 – ca. 1750)

Sometime in the 1730s, either Thomas Bray II or his son James Bray III ordered two new quartering houses built at Utopia. Dubbed Structures 40 and 50 by archaeologists, and both originally 12' by 16', Structure 50 was soon expanded to double its size. Structure 40 had three sub-floor pits, whereas Structure 50 had 18, and each housing unit had an enormous trash pit nearby. The yard space between the two buildings was open, although the occupants of Structure 40 had their own enclosed yard behind the house (see Figure 5.21). Activity at the site came to a close around 1750, not long after Lewis Burwell IV obtained the Utopia property and its slaves in 1745 (see Figure 5.26). It would appear that Period 3 Utopia was in operation for 15 to 20 years, between the 1730s to ca. 1750.

With a succession of ownership changes between 1725 and 1745, and the introduction in the 1730s of dozens of new African slaves within the existing slave population at Littleton/Utopia by Thomas Bray II, Period 3 may have been the most unstable era at Utopia for family development. Documentary evidence indicates that by the mid 1740s the adult sex ratio at Utopia was nearly even, and perhaps 40 percent of the inhabitants were children. This demographic profile suggests that this rather robust community was reproducing itself at a rapid rate. However, there may have been a high turnover rate, and less personal autonomy for slaves to organize households to their own liking due to the fact that between 1740 and up to 1745 or longer an Anglo-American overseer named John Green seems to have managed the affairs at Utopia. Thus, Period 3 Utopia offers a mixed bag in terms of the environment for families, although the demographic components seem to have been in place for it.

Archaeology of Period 3 Burial Ground, ca. 1700 – ca. 1750

Archaeologists uncovered and excavated a burial ground containing 25 human burials situated at the far south end of the Utopia site, near the edge of the bluff overlooking the James River (Table 5.12; see Figure 1.10). The burials were clustered together in a 50' by 80' area, located between a Period 1 boundary ditch on the north, and Structure 70 to the south (Figure 5.30). Based on the sizes of the burial shafts and analysis of the skeletal contents, 13 infants or small children and 12 adults were represented there. Unfortunately, due to the high acidity of the soils the remains were in extremely poor condition which limited the amount of osteological information to be learned from them. No testable bone or teeth remained in 12 of the 13 infant/child burials. And in general the adults were poorly preserved as well.

Table 5.12. Human burial features associated with Period 3 (and possibly Period 4) occupation at Utopia.

Type of Feature	N	Field Numbers	Description
Human Burials	25	FE63, FE68, FE69, FE71, FE72, FE73, FE74, FE75, FE76, FE77, FE78, FE79, FE80, FE81, FE82, FE83, FE84, FE85, FE86, FE87, FE88, FE89, FE90, FE91 KM316	Human burials associated with Period 2 and perhaps Period 3
Total	25		

Although located in close proximity to Period 1 features, the burials were interred later, probably during the Period 3 and possibly the Period 4 occupations.⁸ Pinning a date to the burial ground has proven to be difficult. Two-thirds of the 2,588 artifacts collected

⁸ Burial 69 cut through one of the Structure 70 postholes, and Burial KM316 cut through Feature KM315 (see Figure 5.30), clear indications that the burials were placed in the ground long after these Period 1 features had been erased from the landscape.

from the 25 burials consisted of inadvertently backfilled prehistoric pottery or lithics. The wrought nails used to hold the coffins together made up another 28 percent of the artifact collection, and cannot be correlated to a particular occupation period. By eliminating those nails, only five percent of the 2,588 artifacts excavated from the burial ground dated to the historic period, and most of those probably resulted from Period 1 activity that predates the burials.⁹ Only ten historic ceramic fragments were recovered from the fill from the burials. Five pieces of Yorktown-type coarseware (ca. 1720–1745) in Burials 80, 83, and 90 strongly hint that they were placed in the ground after 1720, probably in the 1730s and 1740s.

Two adult burials (FE86 and KM316) had English clay tobacco pipes purposely placed under the left upper humerus, and another held a complete tobacco pipe in his hand (FE80). All three pipes have maker's marks and pipebowl shapes that suggest a manufacturing date in the second or third quarters of the 18th century (Figure 5.31) (see Kelso 1984:109).¹⁰ The practice of burying the deceased with a tobacco pipe has several historical and archaeological precedents linked to Africans and enslaved African Americans. According to an 18th-century account, it was a common Igbo practice to bury their dead with tobacco pipes (Potkay and Burr 1995:175). Tobacco pipes have been recovered from African-American burials in several African-American contexts, in some cases under the upper left humerus (see Handler and Lange 1978:120-125, 255;

⁹ For example, although the 20 measurable English pipestem bores from the burials are not statistically relevant, the Binford mean date generated by them is 1674, a general indication that most were deposited into the archaeological record during Period 1 activity and later backfilled by chance into the burials.

¹⁰ The pipes in Burial 80 and KM316 have incuse "IW" maker's marks on the bowls and the pipe from Burial 86 has the initials "TD" on the bowl, quite possibly the work of pipemaker Thomas Dormer (ca. 1748 to 1770) (see Atkinson and Oswald 1969:206-207; Oswald 1975:68, 135; Handler and Lange 1978:269; Fox 1999:110). The form of the three pipebowls match Type 25 or 25A, manufactured between 1700 and 1770 (see Atkinson and Oswald 1969; Noël Hume 1969:303; Oswald 1975; Walker 1977).

Gibb 1996:199, 202; Cotter 1958:24). Furthermore, one of the sub-adults (FE69) was interred with a string of glass beads around the neck. The beads are transparent, multi-faceted, amethyst-colored glass (see Figure 5.31). The reflective nature of the beads may have been intended to serve a protective function to ward off evil spirits as the child made its way from the world of the living to the dead (see Franklin 1997:239-246). Except for one burial (FE83) which contained *insitu* cuff buttons and two trouser buttons, no other clothing implements were recovered from the remaining burials. In fact, the presence of brass straight pins in many cases indicated that clothing was removed and the body wrapped in a cloth shroud held together with pins.

Aside from Burial 90 which seems to have contained no coffin, all 24 remaining burials were interred in wooden coffins. Most of the coffins were rectangular boxes, although five were hexagonal in shape. Almost all the burials were oriented on an east/west axis, following the customary procedure for Christian burials, although two (FE86 and KM316) were placed close to a north/south axis (see Walsh 1997:104-107).

Of the 13 burials containing human remains, one was identified as a child age under the age of ten, three were classified as young adults (16-25), four were middle adults (25-35), three were older adults (35+), and two could be identified only as adults (Table 5.13) (Boyd and Boyd 1996:5-6). Sex could be determined for six of the adults, four females and two males (see Table 5.13). Based on "the presence of significant nasal guttering, lower and midfacial prognathism, and a wide interorbital profile" Burial KM316 was identified as having African ancestry (ibid.:6). Burial 90 also indicated "considerable lower facial prognathism" and also typed as African (see Table 5.13) (ibid.). Dental metric data was examined for the Utopia population, but failed as a

definitive indicator of ethnic affiliation (ibid.:6-8). Nonetheless, there is absolutely no doubt all the individuals interred in the Utopia burial ground were enslaved.

Because of poor preservation, dentition patterns were the primary means for obtaining information about pathologies of the Utopia population. Six individuals exhibited dental caries, antemortem tooth loss, enamel hypoplasia, or anomalous wear patterns (Boyd and Boyd 1996:8). Four of the adults had cavities (FE63, FE78, FE82, and FE90). Three individuals had lost teeth prior to death (FE81, FE90, and KM316); with KM316 missing all her teeth in her upper jaw (maxilla). Two individuals exhibited enamel hypoplasia lines (FE63 and FE78), indicators of periods of health stress (ibid.:8-9). Pipe wear facets were observed on the teeth of FE63 and FE90, signs that these two individuals (both females) were long-term tobacco smokers (see Table 5.13).

Table 5.13. Vital statistics for the Utopia burial ground population.

Burial	Age	Sex	Ethnicity	Pipe Facets
63	Middle Adult	Female		Yes
77	Adult	Male (?)		
78	7 - 9			
79	Young Adult			
80	Middle Adult			
81	Older Adult	Female		
82	Middle Adult			
83	Adult			
85	Young Adult (?)			
86	Young Adult	Male		
89	Older Adult			
90	Middle Adult	Female	African American	Yes
KM 316	Older Adult	Female	African American	

Although the diagnostic information related to the burial ground is limited to the three marked pipebowls and a few fragments of dateable ceramics, it appears that it was in use from the 1730s to the 1750s, corresponding with occupation Periods 3 and 4. In

fact, in support of this interpretation, four incuse "IW" pipe marks identical to the two pipes found in Burials 80 and KM316 were found in Period 3 deposits, and none in Periods 2 or 4. Eight "TD" pipe marks similar to the one in Burial 86 were recovered at Utopia, six from Period 4 features, two from Period 3 features, and none from Period 2. The examples of Yorktown coarseware post-dating ca. 1720 in Burials 80, 83, and 90 is an added indication that members of Period 3 Utopia were the first to use the site as a burial ground, perhaps not long after Thomas Bray II purchased temporary ownership rights in 1728. Internments may have continued to occur into the early 1750s based on the apparent Thomas Dormer pipebowl in Burial 86.¹¹

Summary of the History and Archaeology of the Burial Ground (ca. 1700 – ca. 1750)

Several inferences regarding families can be made by considering the demographic and spatial details of the burial ground. For one, given that half of the burials contained infants or small children, the child mortality rate appears to have been dreadfully high (see Boyd and Boyd 1996:8-9). And yet, women at Utopia during Period 3 probably were bearing children at a rate that exceeded the death rate.

Some of the burials appear to be grouped together, suggesting that families had been intact long enough to establish the importance of being buried in close proximity to one another. An argument can be made that there are four groupings present. Burials 82, 89, 90, and 91 are clustered together and consist of a 25 to 35 year old female, a second adult of that age group, an adult over 35 years old, and a small child (see Figure 5.30). A second possible grouping contains Burials 80, 83, 84, and 85; a 16-to-25-year-old adult, a

¹¹ Without the "TD" pipebowl in Burial 86, the preponderance of evidence suggests that use of the burial ground ceased by 1750.

25-to-35-year-old adult, a male (based on the clothing buttons in Burial 83), and a child overlapping the edge of Burial 83 (see Figure 5.30). Burials 63 and 81, a 25-to-35-year-old female, and a female over 35 years old may be paired together because they are related (see Figure 5.30). Finally, Burials 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, and 79 form a row and consist of a 16-to-25-year-old adult with a 7-to-9-year-old child buried right next to it, a male adult nearby, and three children in line south of the male (see Figure 5.30). It is feasible to suggest that this group contains a young mother, a father, and four children. The five child burials grouped together at the south end of the burial ground may be children from young parents who survived them. In at least two cases (Burials 78 and 79, and Burials 83 and 84) it would appear that a child was buried at a later date next to and slightly overlapping an adult, presumably that child's parent or guardian.

Assuming that the burial ground primarily was related to the Period 3 occupation, the demographic data that can be gleaned from it and the spatial layout of the burials both support the contention that families had been established at Utopia. Given an apparently compatible sex ratio, and the high percentage of children occupying the quarter during Period 3, women were bearing children at a rate that outpaced the high child mortality rate. From a demographic perspective then, the burial ground indicates that the residents of Utopia were thriving. Some of the quarter's parents who had witnessed one or more of their children die at a young age, or who stood by helplessly as they were shuffled between Thomas Bray II, James Bray III, and Lewis Burwell IV, may not have felt as if they were "thriving." Indeed, it is important to make the distinction that as a group the population of Utopia during Period 3 was thriving, and the burial ground reflects this.

Period 4. It functioned as a duplex (essentially two houses standing back-to-back) and

However, on an individual basis, grief, apprehension, and instability must have been a regular feature of life.

Archaeology of Period 4 Utopia, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775

Period 4 Utopia consisted of 46 features or macro-features (Figure 5.32; Table 5.14). The macro-features included three structures that left no architectural footprints, and a set of four shallow postholes possibly associated with Structure 140. Sub-floor pits accounted for 24 of the individual features, 22 in Structure 140 and one each in Structures 150 and 160 (Figures 5.33 and 5.34). Three borrow pits were located on site, created by the builders to extract clay during the construction of the structures (Figure 5.35). Nine trash pits of varying sizes and depths were arrayed throughout the site. Several anomalous features were also encountered and excavated (see Table 5.14). All 46 of the Period 4 features were excavated in their entirety and produced 19,040 artifacts.

The method of construction for the Period 4 structures differed from the three previous periods. Instead of framing the buildings on posts set into the ground, the carpenters either laid sills on the ground surface (or in shallow trenches) and erected a log building, or built the cabins on shallow pier supports (see Carson et al. 1981). The cabins left no architectural footprint, although a line of shallow postholes along the south wall of Structure 140 may represent the remnants of piers or later repair or shoring up of that wall (see Figure 5.32). Remnants of piers also may be present for Structures 150 and 160. Lacking a footprint, archaeologists estimated the sizes of each of the three structures based on the sub-floor pits enclosed by them. Structure 140 contained 22 sub-floor pits, was approximately 22' by 32' in size, and served as the main housing unit for Period 4. It functioned as a duplex (essentially two houses standing back-to-back) and

Table 5.14. Historic features associated with Period 4 occupation at Utopia.

Type of Feature	N	Field Numbers	Description
Structures	3	FE140, FE150, FE160	One duplex and two smaller housing units
Sub-floor pits in Structure 140-1	10	FE9, FE10, FE11D/E, FE11/12, FE12A/W, FED/L-N, FE13, FE29, FE40, FE41A,	Sub-floor pits in west duplex of Structure 140
Sub-floor pits in Structure 140-2	12	FE5, FE6B/G/H, FE6C-F/J/K, FE6L/M/N, FEP/Q, FE6R, FE7, FE8, FE30A-D, FE30E/F, FE31, FE36	Sub-floor pits in east duplex of Structure 140
Sub-floor pit in Structure 150	1	FE4	Probable sub-floor pit inside Structure 150
Sub-floor pit in Structure 160	1	FE19	Probable sub-floor pit inside Structure 160
Trash Pits	8	FE1, FE2, FE14, FE15, FE18, FE32, FE33, FE35	Trash pits arrayed around the site
Borrow Pits	3	FE16, FE20, FE21-28	Three debris-filled pits originally dug to extract clay
Set of Postholes	1	FE37, FE38, FE39ab, FE39cd	Possible shallow postholes assoc. with Structure 140
Possible Posthole	1	FE42	Possible posthole for Str. 160
Possible Pier Supports	2	FE45, FE46	Possible pier support holes for Structure 150
Anomalous Features	3	FE34, FE43, FE44, FE47	Two anomalous features inside Str. 160, and two near Str. 140
Total	46		

was divided into two compartments with independent exterior entrances (see Figures 5.32 and 5.33). The sizes of the other two housing units, Structures 150 and 160, could not be determined from the single sub-floor pit located inside each, but based on the possible pier supports, Structure 150 may have been roughly 15' by 17' and Structure 160 was perhaps less than that.

The three borrow pits were located in proximity to each of the housing units, with the largest, Borrow Pit 21-28 nearest Structure 140 (see Figures 5.32 and 5.35). Trash pits were arrayed throughout the yard area, and some of them can be directly related to debris from specific housing units. For example, the contents of Trash Pits 14, 15, and 18 can reasonably be associated with activity in Structure 140 (see Figure 5.32).

Other than borrow and trash pits, landscape features were absent at Period 4 Utopia. The lack of post-and-rail fences, for example, may be explained by changing fencing technology. Like post-in-ground structures, by the mid-18th century post-and-rail fences were being replaced by less labor-intensive and functional worm fences made of logs or rails stacked on the ground. Worm fences could be easily dismantled and moved, leaving ephemeral archaeological traces, whereas post-and-rail fences were more permanent. An artifact distribution and soil chemistry study of Period 4 strongly suggest that a fence was located immediately to the west of Structure 140, forming an enclosed yard or animal pen that abutted up against the main house (see Figure 5.32) (Fesler 2001). The remainder of the yard and the space between the three structures stayed unobstructed, similar to the open yard spaces encountered in earlier periods of occupation at Utopia.

Archaeologists recovered 370 measurable English clay tobacco pipestem fragments, and 39 identifiable tobacco pipebowl types from Period 4 (Table 5.15). All the tobacco pipe dating formulas produced dates within the 30 year period of Lewis Burwell IV ownership of Utopia except for a modified Mallios pipebowl mean date of 1736. The Hansen and Mallios formulas yielded mean dates in the mid-1750s, whereas the Binford and Heighton/Deagan formulas produced mean dates in the late 1760s and

early 1770s. The average of all five dating formulas produced a date of 1757, centered near the midpoint of Lewis IV ownership of the property in 1760. The sense one gets from the pipestem and bowl dates is that the site was most active in the 1750s and 1760s (Figure 5.36). In fact, when Lewis Burwell IV initially acquired Utopia and its slave workforce in 1745, there seems to have been no pressing reason to build new quarters for the slaves. Some years later, probably in the early 1750s cabins were built and activity began at Period 4 Utopia. Furthermore, it is likely that the Period 3 and the Period 4 quarters were occupied concurrently for some of those years. The pipestem and bowl data for both occupation periods support this supposition (cf. Tables 5.10 and 5.15).

Table 5.15. Clay tobacco pipestem dating formulas applied to Period 4 Utopia.

Tobacco Pipe Test					Date
Binford Pipestem Formula ^a					1768
Hanson Pipestem Formula ^b					1753
Heighton/Deagan Pipestem Formula ^c					1773
Mallios Bowl Formula ^d					1754
Mallios Formula w/o Type 26A ^d					1736
Average of the Five Formulas					1757
Bore Diameter	3/64"	4/64"	5/64"	6/64"	Total
Count	24	216	127	3	370
Percent	7%	58%	34%	1%	
Product	72	864	635	18	1589
1589/370 = 4.295					

$$^a Y = 1931.85 - 38.26(4.295) \quad Y = 1768$$

$$^b Y = 1894.88 - 32.98(4.295) \quad Y = 1753$$

$$^c X = (-\log [4.295] + 1.04435) / .05234 = 7.8607 * 22 = 173 + 1600 = 1773$$

$$^d (\text{Type 26A}=21*1770, \text{Type 25 or 25A}=17*1735, \text{Type 25B}=1*1750) = 68415/39 = 1754;$$

Without Type 26A: $31245/18 = 1736$

The Period 4 pipestem histogram provides additional evidence that activity was at its peak in the 1750s and 1760s (Figure 5.37). As expected, the majority (n=58 percent) of the pipestems grouped in the 1750 to 1800 period. However, with 34 percent of the

remaining pipestems in the 1710 to 1750 period, the histogram is weighted to the 1750s and 1760s. Thus, the interpretation of the Period 4 pipestem and bowl formulas and histogram suggests the housing units were built in the early to mid 1750s, perhaps as much as five to ten years after Lewis Burwell IV gained ownership of the property. Activity clearly was on the decline by the 1770s, and almost certainly had ceased by 1780 when Lewis Burwell V owned Utopia.

The mean ceramic date derived from 1,163 ceramic sherds recovered from Period 4 yielded a date of 1727, and did not support the pipestem and bowl data (Table 5.16). Similar to Period 3, the mean ceramic date likely is skewed by the inclusion of several ceramic types that have long production time spans such as delftware (1600-1800), North Devon coarseware and Westerwald stoneware (1600-1775), and intrusive fragments of pearlware (1780-1830) and whiteware (1805-1900). By removing these five ceramic types from the equation, the adjusted mean ceramic date becomes 1744: closer to the apparent era of activity for Period 4, but still predating it. The "use life" of ceramics at Utopia may be the primary factor hampering the accuracy of the mean date for Periods 3 and 4. Typically slaves tended to use older ceramic vessels, and curate them for long periods of time, sometimes receiving hand-me-downs from the owner (see Otto 1984). It would not be uncommon for slaves to be eating and preparing food with ceramic vessels that were 30, 40, or 50 or more years old (Katz-Hyman 1993). This phenomenon may explain the earlier ceramic mean dates for Utopia. For example, archaeologists recovered 139 fragments of coarseware and stoneware manufactured by a local pottery in Yorktown between 1720 and 1745 from Period 4. Slaves on site were using Yorktown-type pottery vessels at least a decade or two after the pottery kiln ceased its operation.

Table 5.16. Mean date for identifiable Period 4 Utopia ceramic sherds.

Ceramic Type	Sherds	Mean Date	Sum
Coarseware unidentified	4	1750	7000
Buckley Coarseware	6	1727.5	10365
North Devon Coarseware	4	1687.5	6750
Pennsylvania Coarseware	9	1790	16110
Pennsylvania Coarseware Iron Glaze	1	1790	1790
Staffordshire Iron Glaze Coarseware	12	1710	20520
Staffordshire Mottled Glaze Coarseware	41	1730	70930
Yorktown Coarseware	112	1735	194320
Agateware	36	1757.5	63270
Colonoware	49	1722.5	84402.5
Creamware	37	1791	66267
Delft all kinds	324	1700	550800
Jackfield	41	1760	72160
Pearlware	2	1805	3610
Pennsylvania Slipware	12	1780	21360
Staffordshire Slipware	18	1727.5	31095
Staffordshire Combed Slipware	42	1727.5	72555
Staffordshire Bat Molded	1	1737.5	1737.5
Staffordshire Dot Slipware	18	1737.5	31275
Staffordshire Reverse Slipware	5	1727.5	8637.5
Whieldon Ware	5	1755	8775
Whieldon Clouded Ware	4	1755	7020
Whiteware	2	1852.5	3705
English Brown Stoneware	42	1732.5	72765
Fulham Stoneware	1	1727.5	1727.5
Nottingham Stoneware	9	1747.5	15727.5
English White Salt Glazed Stoneware	122	1747.5	213195
English White Salt Glazed Enameled Stw	11	1760.5	19365.5
English White Salt Glazed Scratch Blue Stw	11	1762.5	19387.5
English White Salt Scratch Blue Debased Stw	2	1770	3540
White Salt Glazed Slip Dipped Stoneware	5	1745	8725
Frechen Stoneware	2	1650	3300
Westerwald Stoneware	88	1687.5	148500
Chinese Porcelain	58	1750	101500
Yorktown Stoneware	27	1732.5	46777.5
Totals	1163		2008965
Mean Ceramic Date			1727.4

A chart of the intersecting production spans of the Period 4 ceramic types provides a more realistic depiction of the length of Period 4 activity (see South 1977:214-

217). By eliminating four intrusive sherds of pearlware and whiteware recovered from the surface of the site, the bracketing of ceramic production periods establishes a date range of activity between 1745 and 1765 for Period 4 (Figure 5.38). This coincides with the year Lewis Burwell IV acquired the property in 1745 and 20 years later when he began moving slaves and resources from Kingsmill/Utopia to the west in Mecklenburg County in the mid 1760s.

Archaeologists recovered two heavily worn coins dated between 1729 and 1739 from the Period 4 features. The coin dated 1729 was from a lower layer in Sub-Floor Pit 29 in Duplex 1. The other coin came from the top layer of a borrow pit feature and dated between 1729 and 1739. Given time for wear, the coins probably found their way into the archaeological record in the 1760s or 1770s.

The various dating techniques and formulas applied to Period 4 indicate a median date of activity in the 1750s, with a continuation of activity at the site into the 1760s (see Figure 5.36). Structure 140, the duplex, probably was built first at the site between 1750 and 1755, perhaps prompted by the destruction or abandonment of the housing units nearby at Period 3. The two smaller housing units, Structures 150 and 160 may have been built a few years later. By the mid 1760s Lewis IV began gearing up to move west. By the early 1770s the effects of these changes were probably observable in the reduction of the workforce living at Utopia. And by 1775 when Lewis V took over management of Kingsmill/Utopia it would appear that the Utopia Quarter was abandoned at that time or shortly thereafter. Certainly by 1781 when the property was the scene of a skirmish between British and American forces, and the year that Lewis V put up the plantation for sale, Utopia was no longer in operation.

Summary of the History and Archaeology of Period 4 (ca. 1750 – ca. 1775)

Evidence suggests that when Lewis Burwell IV took over ownership of Utopia in 1745 he initially maintained the status quo, even keeping John Green in his position as overseer. By the early 1750s (and perhaps a few years earlier) he had a large duplex cabin built at the Utopia Quarter, and two nearby smaller housing units (see Figure 5.32). The residents of the duplex dug 22 sub-floor pits of varying sizes, whereas only single sub-floor pits were needed in each of the smaller houses. The yard was scattered with at least nine trash pits and three large borrow pits filled with rubbish and trash. By the mid-to late 1760s the resident population of Period 4 Utopia began to be depleted as Lewis IV gradually moved his plantation operation westward. By 1775 he deeded Kingsmill/Utopia to his son, and at that time or shortly thereafter the Utopia Quarter was abandoned for good.

If the relative stability of slave life at Kingsmill/Utopia solely was measured by the number of Burwell runaway slaves, the first 20 years from between 1744 and ca. 1765 was a much better period compared to the final decade between ca. 1765 and 1775. Documentary evidence reveals that the general makeup of the Burwell slave population was steady for the first two decades, Burwell bought few if any new Africans, and the slaves had children at a rapid rate, all signs that the conditions for family and household growth were favorable. However, by the latter 1760s and certainly by the 1770s, the climate for family stability grew much worse as Lewis IV culled his slave workforce and prepared to relocate west. By estimation, virtually every slave family living at Kingsmill/Utopia in the 1760s and 1770s experienced the loss of at least one family member, and probably more. What had been perhaps the Utopia Quarter's most stable

period for family and household growth between 1744 and ca. 1765 was all but erased by the sell-off in the late 1760s and 1770s.

An Archaeological and Historical Timeline for the Utopia Quarter

The Utopia Quarter site was occupied continuously for almost exactly a century from the 1670s to the 1770s by four different groups. Over that span of time the site was owned or controlled by eight individuals (Figure 5.39). Five of those eight owners played a principal role in the development of each of the four major periods of occupation. The management decisions of these five planters—Thomas Pettus II, James Bray II, Thomas Bray II and James Bray III, and Lewis Burwell IV—determined when, and where, and what was built at the Utopia Quarter. Some of the occupations may have been concurrent for a short period, or there may have been a short hiatus between them (see Figure 5.39). One method to determine this is to compare the four English clay tobacco pipe histograms (see Deetz 1987; Edwards and Brown 1993) (Figure 5.40).

Periods 1 and 3 produced histograms quite similar in shape, and Period 2 and 4 also have a similar appearance (see Figure 5.40). The shape of Periods 1 and 3 are flatter, thereby suggesting a longer period of activity than the taller Period 2 and 4 histograms.¹²

A comparison of the four histograms indicates:

- a) if the shape of the Period 1 histogram is accepted, the occupation of Period 1 may have been longer than initially anticipated, perhaps from ca. 1670 to ca. 1710;
- b) if the shape of the Period 1 histogram is skewed and actually peaks higher at the 7/64" bore diameter than indicated in this chart, then there probably was a hiatus of activity at Utopia in the first decade of the 18th century;

¹² The shape of the Period 1 histogram may be artificially flatter, however, due to the fact that some debris generated by the Period 2 residents probably was discarded into the open half cellar and well from Period 1. If these intrusive pipestems were eliminated, a more realistic shape for the Period 1 histogram would be a high peak for the 7/64" stem bores with a steady drop-off instead of a secondary peak for 6/64" stem bores (see Figure 5.40).

- c) Period 2 may have been the shortest occupation, quite possibly from the 1710s to the early 1730s;
- d) Period 3 could have spanned from the early 1730s well into the 1750s;
- e) Periods 3 and 4 could have overlapped, both occupied during the 1750s, with Period 4 continuing into the 1770s (see Figure 5.40).

The other diagnostic techniques applied to the four occupation periods generally support the histogram data (cf. Figures 5.39 and 5.40). In particular, the data suggest that a hiatus of activity occurred at the Utopia Quarter for roughly a decade between Periods 1 and 2 from 1700 to 1710. It is quite possible that James Bray II placed a workforce of slaves at Utopia around the year 1710 and not before. The diagnostic information also intimates that as much as a five-year overlap occurred between Periods 3 and 4, with both sites in operation concurrently. A plausible, but unsupported, explanation for this might be that when Lewis Burwell IV acquired Utopia in 1745, he built a cabin at the site for his overseer John Green. Green could have lived in the Period 4 duplex for several years, until eventually the houses at Period 3 became uninhabitable and the slaves then were moved to the Period 4 site permanently.

Knowledge of the exact beginning and ending dates for each occupation is less important for this study than being able to establish that the four occupation periods occurred in a sequence, and over time the conditions for slave household and family development changed. Based on all the available historic documentation the climate for family development can be roughly charted (Figure 5.41). Although Figure 5.41 simply is a subjective estimate of the conditions for building households and families, the two low points appear to have been during the inception of Period 2 and at the end of the

occupation in the 1770s when well-developed family groups were dispersed by Lewis Burwell IV. However, the general conditions for bearing and raising children with a spouse improved for most Chesapeake slaves as time passed, and this seems to have been the case at Utopia as well.

Figure 5.1. Map of archaeological components related to Period I occupation at Utopia (ca. 1675-1700).

Figure 5.1. Map of archaeological components related to Period 1 occupation at Utopia (ca. 1675-1700).

Figure 5.2. Conjectural drawing of the main dwelling house at Period 1 Utopia (Kelso 1984:75).

Figure 5.3. Overview of half cellar under main dwelling house at Period 1 Utopia, facing southwest.

Figure 5.4. Interior of half cellar at Period 1 Utopia, facing west.

Figure 5.5. Upper layers of well at Period 1 Utopia, facing west.

Figure 5.6. Profile of well at Period 1 Utopia, facing west.

Figure 5.7. Artifacts arrayed around bisected oval trash pit at Period 1 Utopia.

Figure 5.8. Plan and profile of oval trash pit at Period 1 Utopia.

Figure 5.9. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 1 Utopia.

Figure 5.10. Ceramic type date range intersection as determined by Kelso (1984).

Figure 5.11. Period 1 ceramic type date range based on the entire ceramic collection.

Figure 5.12. Period 1 ceramic type date range with intrusive well layers removed.

Figure 5.13. Period 1 Utopia timeline with dating formulas.

Figure 5.14. Map of archaeological components of Period 2 occupation at Utopia.

Figure 5.15. Excavation of FE36, a large sub-floor pit in Structure 10.

Figure 5.16. Overview of the compound of dwellings at Period 2 Utopia, facing north.

Figure 5.17. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 5.18. Ceramic type date range intersection from sealed contexts, Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 5.19. Adjusted ceramic type date range intersection from sealed contexts, Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 5.20. Period 2 Utopia timeline with dating formulas.

Figure 5.21. Map of archaeological components of Period 3 occupation at Utopia.

Figure 5.22. Overview of Structure 40 with three sub-floor pits inside, facing east.

Figure 5.23. Overview of Structure 50 with 18 sub-floor pits, facing southeast.

Figure 5.24. Southwest view of Trash Pits 62, 119, and 127 located near Structure 40.

Figure 5.25. Overview of Trash Pit 61 located near Structure 50, facing south-southeast.

Figure 5.26. Period 3 Utopia timeline with dating formulas.

Figure 5.27. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 3 Utopia.

Figure 5.28. Ceramic type production intersections from sealed contexts, Period 3 Utopia.

Figure 5.29. Adjusted ceramic type production intersections from sealed contexts, Period 3 Utopia.

Figure 5.30. Map of Utopia burial ground.

Figure 5.31. Clay tobacco pipe in Burial KM316 and bead necklace in Burial 69.

Figure 5.32. Map of archaeological components of Period 4 occupation at Utopia.

Figure 5.33. Overview of sub-floor pits inside Structure 140.

Figure 5.34. Excavation of Sub-Floor Pit 9 located inside Structure 140.

Figure 5.35. Excavation of Borrow Pit 21-28 as divided into eight sections.

Figure 5.35. Excavation of Borrow Pit 21-28 as divided into eight sections.

Figure 5.36. Period 4 Utopia timeline with dating formulas.

Figure 5.37. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 4 Utopia.

Figure 5.37. Harrington histogram of the pipestem bore diameters for Period 4 Utopia.

Figure 5.38. Ceramic type production date range intersection for Period 4 Utopia.

Figure 5.39. Timeline of occupation at the Utopia Quarter with dating formulas applied.

Figure 5.40. English clay tobacco pipestem histogram for the four occupation periods at the Utopia Quarter.

Figure 5.41. Prospective chart of conditions for family development at Utopia compared to the overall Chesapeake.

CHAPTER VI.

ARCHITECTURAL CHANGE AND THE SLAVE FAMILY

Now you can tear a building down
But you can't erase a memory
These houses may look all run down
But they have a value you can't see

Living Colour,
Open Letter (to a Landlord), (1988)

Although circumstances varied from plantation to plantation in the Chesapeake, and family formation occurred at different rates depending upon a range of demographic, social, and economic variables, in general the environment for the establishment of conjugal relationships and the production of children, and most importantly, the possibility of residing in the same dwelling with a spouse and children, became better with the passing of time (Norton et al. 1983; Kulikoff 1986:319-380; Stevenson 1996:206-257; Berlin 1998:40-41, 129-131, 266, 271; Morgan 1998:498-558).

The ramifications of this gradual improvement presumably are observable in assorted forms of material culture. At places like Utopia, the most conspicuous form of material culture is the houses that these families came to occupy (see Chappell 1994:168-169). Historians of 18th-century African-American history make a logical supposition stated succinctly by Philip Morgan: "Slave accommodations became more private, substantial, and orderly over time. Single cabins and duplexes gradually supplanted dormitories" (1998:104, 108; see also Isaac 1982:30-32, 305-306; Kelso 1984:30-31; Kulikoff 1986:368-369; Sobel 1987:100-126; Edwards 1991; Kolchin 1993:50; Chappell 1994:191-193, 209-210; Walsh 1997:19-20; Berlin 1998:113, 132-133). In short, the average slave quarter housing unit became smaller over time, a phenomenon that can be investigated with archaeological data. The most significant factor prompting this

architectural evolution from large barracks to smaller cabins was changing needs of the slaves themselves due to the gradual increase in simple slave families and the growth of slave households from what typically had been coresidential groups.

During the height of the slave trade between the last decade of the 17th century, and early decades of the 18th century, most slave owners placed large groups of newly enslaved Africans into living quarters that functioned like group residences. As slave populations eventually increased through childbearing, the flow of the slave trade diminished, and slave housing needs changed. By forging networks of kin ties and family groups within the strictures of their enslavement, slaves compelled slave holders to adapt housing strategies. Later owners responded by providing smaller houses better suited for simple or extended families of slaves. There may have been a trade-off involved. In some cases the amount of interior space (square feet) per person had the potential to be greater in a barracks, whereas in family cabins living spaces may have been more cramped (see Morgan 1998:11-112). Yet slave families valued privacy, and accepted less physical space per person if they were sharing those smaller spaces with friends and family as opposed to strangers.

This issue of changing housing unit size is rooted in one of the fundamental principles of architectural study—the interplay between form and function. A perennial question addressed by students of architecture and architectural history is: does form follow function, or function follow form (see Twombly 1986; Krufft 1994; Leach 1997)? At Utopia the question pertains to whether the shape, size, layout, and structural elements of the housing units dictated how the inhabitants were able to function, or whether the actions of the slaves determined the forms of their quarters. Inevitably, the types of

buildings certainly influenced the interrelations of the inhabitants. But just as importantly, the ways in which people adapted to their surroundings shaped their environment. This relationship between architectural form and function at Utopia triggered change, with the slaves in residence influencing the forms of housing units built for them, but those housing units in turn shaping social relations. However, the gradual construction of smaller housing units (form) seems to have been prompted by the shifting needs of slaves who were increasingly living in families (function).

While there is general agreement that the average slave quarter housing unit grew smaller over time, few have attempted to apply archaeological data to this phenomenon, nor has the link between family growth and house size firmly been established. Up to this point the 18th-century evolution of housing to accommodate the rise of the slave family is based on very fragmentary descriptive testimony, historical inference, and almost no direct physical evidence. For example, while architectural historians have documented a large sample of surviving Chesapeake slave quarter structures, almost all of them date to the 19th century (see Upton 1982; Vlach 1993). The number of standing 18th-century Chesapeake slave quarters is miniscule, too small to make comparisons with the existing 19th-century examples (see Chappell 1994:192). However, archaeological data, in the form of posthole patterns and foundations, are available for a sizeable number of late 17th- and 18th-century slave quarters (see Fesler 1997b).

The remainder of this chapter is divided into four sections intended to examine the changing architectural form and function of slave quarters at Utopia and the larger Chesapeake. First, the history of the emergence and evolution of the slave quarter is reviewed, both its physical appearance and its manner of construction, and the quarter's

changing usage by Chesapeake slaves. Second, the nine housing units identified at Utopia are assessed and compared over time. Third, a dataset of 73 slave housing units excavated throughout the Chesapeake region (including the nine at Utopia) is analyzed. In particular, I explore the changes in the size, configuration, and type of construction of slave quarters from the late 17th to the 19th century. Based on the findings, in a final brief section of the chapter I revisit the issue of slave quarter architecture and its relationship to the growth of slave households and families. The working hypothesis is that slave housing units decreased in size over time, and other design elements were modified, indicating an alteration in coresidence patterns as slaves formed family bonds and slave owners responded by building quarters more readily able to accommodate kin.

The Architectural Emergence of the Slave Quarter

Separate housing for plantation workers based on social standing was almost unheard of prior to the late 17th century. A planter, his family, and any indentured servants or those rare African slaves typically would reside in the same dwelling together, perhaps retiring to separate rooms or areas to sleep, but usually sharing the same hearth and the same table (see e.g., Upton 1982:2-3; Carr et al. 1991). Some of the wealthier planters could afford to house laborers in a separate nearby structure in the yard, but dispersed quarters on distant parts of the plantation were rare. A visitor to Virginia in 1687 described a typical Chesapeake plantation thusly:

Whatever their rank . . . they build only two rooms with some closets on the ground floor, & only two rooms in the attic above; but they build several like this according to their means. They build a separate kitchen, a separate house for their Christian slaves, one for the negro slaves . . . so that when you come to the home of a person of some means, you think you are entering a fairly large village. (de Dauphine 1934:119)

This evidently was how Thomas Pettus I operated the Littletown/Utopia plantation in the 1650s and 1660s; his workforce lived at his plantation house which served as the center of plantation life for all residents. In the evenings after the workday, Littletown must have bustled with activity as people prepared meals and went about the business of other chores. The social division between planter and laborer in this type of setting was fluid enough to allow for daily interaction.

By the beginning of the 18th century the social worlds of planters and laborers were changing, and with this reordering the physical layout of Chesapeake plantations were transformed as well. This dramatic shift occurred at Littletown/Utopia in the 1670s when Thomas Pettus II built a separate quarter on the Utopia tract to house the majority of his field workers. Less than a mile physically separated Littletown plantation from the Utopia Quarter, and yet the social divide between Pettus and his laborers was forever altered, creating a gap as much symbolic as real between social groups. This separation of social spheres that occurred in the latter decades of the 17th century at places like Littletown/Utopia was prompted in large part by the influx of large numbers of African slaves who were quickly replacing English indentured servants (see Galenson 1981; Menard 1977; 1988; Horn 1994).

The classic archaeological study of the physical transformation of a plantation landscape is Fraser Neiman's work at The Clifts Plantation in Westmoreland County, Virginia (1980a; 1980b; 1987). Occupied between ca. 1670 and ca. 1730, Neiman was able to track social changes at Clifts as expressed in the archaeological record. Initially, the main house, or "manner house" at Clifts, was the epicenter of most all domestic activity such as cooking, dairying, and other plantation-related work. Servants lived in an

adjacent quartering house, but had easy access to the large hall in the manner house where much of the daily activity took place for both the planter family and the laborers (Neiman 1980b:31). By the 1690s, however, the planter reconfigured space inside the manner house and changed its traffic pattern. Archaeological evidence illustrates that the house's central passage was blocked, which effectively closed off direct access into it for non-family members. To reach the now private interior sections of the manner house a visitor had to penetrate through at least two thresholds. The imposition of these new social spheres also is demonstrated by the construction of a new quarter to replace the original one, and by greater concentrations of artifacts around the quarter, illustrating that it had become the focal point of daily activity for the common laborers working at Clifts (ibid:30-36; 1987:3124-3126). According to Neiman, the changes in the social order at Clifts were not determined by the presence of African slaves, but rather by "changes in the nature of the white labor force," although substantial numbers of slaves were living at The Clifts by 1705 (1980b:35).

At Littletown/Utopia the physical segregation of planter and laborer was much more pronounced than at The Clifts. Instead of blocking passages into the main house or placing fences in the yard to impede direct access, Thomas Pettus II and his successors removed the majority of the field workers to distant quarters. Following Pettus II, three generations of Brays and then Lewis Burwell IV maintained Utopia as an outlying quarter, each periodically rebuilding the houses when needed. For the larger plantations, this pattern of satellite quarters at a generous remove from the main house became the norm by the mid 18th century. One visitor to Virginia in 1746 described a slave quarter as "a Number of Huts or Hovels, built at some Distance from the Mansion-House; where

the Negroes reside with their Wives and Families, and cultivate, at vacant Times, the little Spots allow'd them" (Kimber 1907:148). This system of outlying quarters had the effect of isolating slaves, but also provided a buffer of sorts that allowed them to manage their off hours relatively unencumbered by planter interference. The same observer noted, "The Negroes . . . at set Times have a pretty deal of Liberty in their Quarter" (ibid.). Indeed, the quarters became, as one researcher has termed it, "slaves' territory," largely controlled and internally organized by their design (Upton 1990:74).

"After having cutt down a few Trees," the first order of business at any new plantation advised Carolina planter Thomas Nairne in 1710 was, "to split Palisades or Clapboards and therewith make small Houses or Huts to shelter the slaves" (in Carson et al. 1981:140). Slaves provided virtually all of the labor during the construction of quarters, but presumably few had an active role in the layout or design of what was built, at least not until the latter half of the 18th century (see Morton 1956:76, Genovese 1976:528; S. Jones 1985:196, 200, Abrahams and Szwed 1983:52). In fact, in the case of Utopia, all the buildings conform to standard English measurements (the 16' rod, for instance), and reflect an English vernacular architectural tradition (Carson 1974; Marzio 1972; Oszuscik 1992; Glassie 1975; Upton 1982; Carson et al. 1981; Herman 1984:277-278; Neiman 1987:3113-3116; Sobel 1987:115-117). However, it has been argued that over time some African modes of architecture and innovation—the balloon frame, what became the dogtrot and the shotgun house forms, porches, and an African proxemic preference for smaller interior spaces—were adopted as part of the vernacular language used by Chesapeake builders both black and white (S. Jones 1985; Sobel 1987:118-126; Vlach 1990:122-138; 1993:153-182; Deetz 1996:218-211). At the very least, this

apparent creolization process of 18th-century Chesapeake carpentry is a reminder that an "African aesthetic" may be embedded in the posthole patterns of slave quarter structures such as those at Utopia (Sobel 1987:124).

Although buildings erected for slaves have been characterized as "impermanent," the construction of a timber-framed dwelling was no small task (see Carson et al. 1981). Raising a building could take several months for a crew of workers, and the knowledge of a competent carpenter was necessary to oversee and delegate tasks (Underhill 1991). Throughout the 17th century, builders typically raised houses by seating wooden posts in prepared holes, a technique later known as *post-in-ground* or *earthfast* construction (Carson et al. 1981:136;143). Frames were assembled on the ground, lifted into place, and then jockeyed into position and fit together, a labor-intensive process requiring many pairs of hands and a good deal of strength. Once the frame was set, depending upon resources, a builder then attached clapboard siding to the walls, clapboarded the roof, and built a heat source. The quality of a wood framing could vary widely. On the high end of the spectrum interior walls could be plastered and filled with nogging for insulation, sheathing on the roof could be tightly fit to prevent leaks, a wood floor could be set on top of a ground laid or raised sill, and brick fireplaces and chimneys could provide light and heat. Most slave houses did not receive these types of amenities, and the typical slave quarter was drafty, leaky, had a dirt floor, and a clay-and-stick chimney.

In 1754 planter Joseph Ball sent instructions to his farm manager in Lancaster County, Virginia, to build a quarter for a favored house slave named Aron who was dispatched to an outlying farm quarter. Ball's detailed description of the type of structure he wanted erected provides valuable insight into the prevailing methods of construction

used for slave quarters at mid-century.

I would have a framed House Twelve foot Long, and ten foot wide built for him; and the End sill where the fire is to be must be at least three foot above the upper side of the other sill; and it must be made up from the Ground to that with Clay, and then from that Quite up to the top Lathed and filled; and all the whole House must be Lathed and filled, and the Lock I have sent with him put upon the Door. . . I would have the house no more than Seven foot pitch from the upper side of the sill to the lower side of the Plate; and I would the Loft laid with Inch plank. . . and I would have it underpinned with brick or stone five Inches above Ground if it can reasonably be done; else I would have sills of Locust Cedar or Mulberry or other lasting wood laid part in the Ground and five Inches above, and the other sills laid upon them; and the House must be Jutted four Inches; and it must be very well and Tight covered; and I would have the floor Raised within two Inches of the upper side of the lower sill. (Ball Letterbook, April 23, 1754)

Based on this description Ball's slave Aron was to receive a small, but relatively well appointed insulated cabin, with a loft, a raised wood floor, and even a door lock for security. Earlier than same year Ball envisioned a quarter for another of his favorite slaves, a woman named Martha, as "a Cabbin built up for her Seven foot Long, and Eight foot wide, and Lathed and filled, so as to be thorough dry" (ibid.:February 19, 1754).

While only providing 56 square feet of living space, Martha was to be housed in the same manner as Aron. For other of his field slaves Ball was less inclined to build such comfortable housing.¹ Instead of choosing to build anew, Ball often advised extensive repair of standing quarters by making them "well posted on the Inside" or "new posted," meaning to replace the existing posts with new ones, usually by cutting the old post into two pieces near the ground, digging out the "stump," and fitting in a wood block in its place for the remaining upper portion of the post to rest on (see Carson et al. 1981). It is

¹ Ball, like most planters, used architecture to signal a plantation hierarchy. At one point he instructed a 15' by 20' one-room slave quarter to be built at the same time as a 15' by 25' overseer's house partitioned into two rooms (Ball Letterbook, October 9, 1758).

unclear from Ball's descriptions whether the old field quarters had raised wood floors.

Most architectural historians suggest that post-in-ground construction was a method inherited from England, and then over time adapted into a distinct Chesapeake vernacular architectural tradition more appropriate to the unique circumstances of plantation agriculture (Carson et al. 1981:158-159; Neiman 1987). In fact, by the latter decades of the 17th century carpenters had developed "a type of house so different from English farmhouses and so universally acceptable to tobacco planters . . . that it was known by a shorthand phrase as the 'Virginia style' or the 'Virginia house'" (Carson 1974:186). The Virginia house normally consisted of two ground-floor rooms with a loft above. The floor plan was known as a hall and parlor, and the structure, like those that Joseph Ball had built, usually was framed on an interrupted sill, covered with clapboard, and often rested on a dirt floor (Joseph Ball's constructions notwithstanding) (see Glassie 1968:66-67; Carson et al. 1981:143).

By the age of Washington and Jefferson, however, log houses or houses set on full brick or stone foundations began to replace post-in-ground structures for Chesapeake slaves and non-slaves alike (Carson et al. 1981:163; Upton 1988:359; Lanier and Herman 1997:63). Instead of placing posts in the ground, logs were placed directly on the ground, a sill rested on top of brick or stone piers, or in rarer cases, a brick foundation was perched atop a full basement (Glassie 1968; Jordan and Kaups 1989:135-178; Underhill 1991:3-44; Lanier and Herman 1997:71-76). Planter William Byrd encountered an early example of log cabin architecture on the frontier during a boundary survey of the Virginia and North Carolina border in 1728. "Most of the Houses in this Part of the Country are Log-houses," wrote Byrd, "covered in Pine or Cypress Shingles, 3 feet long, and one

broad. They are hung upon Laths with Peggs, and their doors too turn upon Wooden Hinges, and have wooden Locks to Secure them, so that the Building is finisht without Nails or other Iron-work" (1841). Post-in-ground architecture endured into the 1750s and 1760s in some areas of tidewater Virginia, and in most settled areas of the Chesapeake. However, the transformation to log architecture was nearly complete by the 1770s, and by the end of the American Revolution builders continued to use post-in-ground construction almost exclusively for farm buildings such as barns, stables, and storage sheds (Lanier and Herman 1997:63-66).

The reasons for the abandonment of post-in-ground construction in the decades leading up to the American Revolution largely was due to the fact that builders recognized that log structures were easier, faster, and cheaper to prepare and assemble in comparison to the cutting, sawing, hewing, joining, and lifting involved in post-in-ground construction. In remote areas where supplies were at a premium, log cabin architecture had the obvious advantage of not requiring iron nails or other hardware. Moreover, if in a pinch, a single person or a pair working together could build a log cabin, whereas a gang of laborers was usually needed for post construction. Thus, on the frontier the log cabin was chosen by necessity due to a lack of labor and provisions, whereas in settled areas of the Chesapeake log architecture was adopted rather quickly as a cost and labor saving measure. For a slave owner there was little reason to expend the time, labor, and expense to build post-in-ground quarters when log cabins would do just fine.

While slave quarter architecture changed substantially in the second half of the 18th century, the changes in architectural form appear to have had minimal effect on the living conditions inside the cabins. By the late 18th century and especially into the 19th

century one qualitative improvement to slave cabins involved the addition of a raised wood floor. However, conditions varied depending upon circumstances. For instance, an Englishman visiting Virginia in 1784 described what can be considered a typical slave cabin as "one small room, not lathed or plastered, neither ceiled nor lofted above, and only thin boards for its covering—one window but no glass in it; it had not even a brick chimney, and as it stood on blocks about a foot above the ground, the hogs lay under the floor which made it swarm with flies" (Smyth 1784). In this case, the raised wooden floor seems to have made conditions worse, not better, for the inhabitants.

The most important change in slave quarter architecture in the second half of the 18th century appears to have been a reduction in house size, presumably to accommodate the increasing number of families and kin groups who desired more private housing. Earlier in the 18th century the majority of Chesapeake planters purportedly chose to house their slaves in group residences or barracks that more closely resembled barns than homes. The use of barracks to house slaves was relatively rare outside the Chesapeake region. In the Caribbean and the Carolina Lowcountry, for instance, slave owners never resorted to group housing to the size and scale that Chesapeake planters did (see Armstrong 1990; Morgan 1998:498-558). The reasons for this might be found in a general indifference toward Africans that developed among most Chesapeake planters. Whereas planters elsewhere differentiated between slaves from different parts of Africa, requesting certain types and rejecting others, Chesapeake buyers had little interest in the ethnic origins of incoming slaves (Mullin 1992:15, 162-163; Morgan 1998:65-68). As the slave trade introduced droves of black bodies to the Chesapeake throughout the early 18th century, many of these transplanted Africans were regarded by planters to be closer slaves as human beings, otherwise barracks would have persisted until the Civil War (1984:273-274).

to draft animals than human beings (Jordan 1968:230-234; Morgan 1998:271-272).

Chesapeake planters used the term "outlandish" to describe all imported Africans, and this seems a fitting synopsis of the perspective most of them had toward African peoples. Given this outlook, the use of barracks housing would have taken little forethought.

The insensate Chesapeake attitude toward slaves gradually changed in conjunction with the decline of the African slave trade. Prior to the American Revolution, few planters wrestled with the moral dilemmas of slavery. As long as new Africans continued to flow into the Chesapeake, planters reduced them to subhuman status, and packed them into barracks. Only as the native-born slave population grew, did slave owners sometimes establish relationships with their slaves on a humane, even personal level. Savvy planters recognized the changing demography of their slaves and reevaluated their housing strategies. By facilitating family growth, slave owners reaped the benefits of a more docile slave population, reduced the instances of flight, and eventually profited from the natural increase of their slaves (Walsh 1997:118; Berlin 1998:129). Housing changes reflect a new willingness of Chesapeake slave owners to adapt new management strategies.² Campaigns for more humane treatment for slaves began to emerge after the American Revolution, a direct result of the new principles of freedom and humanity that had been instilled in the new democratic nation.

Another reason that post-Revolutionary slave owners were quick to embrace new modes of slave housing was in an effort to better control them. Larry McKee (1992:204) observes that by the early 19th century slave cabin architecture had become standardized,

² Bernard Herman concludes that the transformation from slave barracks to single family housing in the decades after the American Revolution signaled an ability on the part of slave owners to consider their slaves as human beings, otherwise barracks would have persisted until the Civil War (1984:273-274).

cabins often were placed on the landscape in an orderly fashion, and they were raised off the ground supposedly to promote healthier living standards. In this manner, by using architecture, 19th-century slave owners hoped to reflect a paternalistic concern for the well-being of the slaves, while at the same time reinforcing the lowly social position of those same slaves in substandard dwellings compared to their own brick or wood framed homes (*ibid.*:200-201; see also Chapman 1991; Vlach 1995).

Bernard Herman concluded some years ago that slave quarters tend to tell us more about the planter than the slaves (1984:277). This certainly is so with regard to the form of structures such as those at Utopia. Utopia's owners decided upon the materials, the dimensions of each of the dwellings, and other factors that had a direct impact on the quality of life lived inside each of the nine quartering houses at the site. And yet, while the basic parameters of slave quarters can be reconstructed from the physical evidence, not even the best preserved slave cabin can provide an understanding of how its inhabitants comprehended their environment. Architectural historian Ed Chappell acknowledges that slaves must have "created mental divisions that allowed them to feel a degree of seclusion within the household as well as a sense of practical order. Such imaginary walls might organize interior space very effectively for the residents of a small dwelling and yet go wholly unperceived by guests" (1994:205). Thus, the function of slave quarters at places like Utopia must be inferred from the physical evidence, sometimes from the barest of bones, such as the simple dimensions of each building and a few of its most basic elements such as its type of heat source, flooring, windows, and doors.

Changing Structures at the Utopia Quarter

A dozen buildings were constructed at the Utopia Quarter between ca. 1675 and ca. 1775 (Table 6.1). Nine of the twelve served as dwellings, creating ten housing units (Structure 140 was a duplex) and they are the focal point of this section. The ten housing units are discussed by occupation period in order of appearance on the landscape.

Period 1, ca. 1675 – 1700

The Period 1 occupation at Utopia consisted of two structures, a large main house and an outbuilding that probably functioned as a tobacco barn. The structures were closely aligned with one another and the original core of each was identical in size, suggesting that they were built at the same moment in time by the same carpenter (see Figure 5.1). The Period 1 main house was excavated in the 1970s (Kelso 1976; 1984:72–76), whereas the tobacco barn (Structure 70) was excavated in the mid 1990s (Fesler 2000:52–55). During the original excavation in the 1970s archaeologists nicknamed the main house the Utopia Cottage.

Housing Unit, KM306/KM308 (Utopia Cottage)

The builders employed post-in-ground construction to erect the building which was set on eight main structural posts to form a core 18' by 29' in size (as measured from postmold centers) (Figure 6.1). The structure was oriented on an east (29'-wall) to west (18'-wall) axis. The eight posts formed three bays, each a fraction more than 9.5' in length and 18' wide. Three smaller posts on 9.0' centers at each gable end formed two end bays, both 4.5' by 18' in size. In total, with the end bays, the structure was 18' by 38' in size and stood on 14 postholes (see Figure 6.1). With the addition of the half bays

Table 6.1. Architecture at the Utopia Quarter, ca. 1675 – ca. 1775.

	Size	Sq. Ft.	Rooms	Hall Pits	Parlor Pits	Total Pits	Floor	Chimney
Period 1, ca. 1675 – 1700								
1. Main House	18 x 38	684	2	--	--	1*	wood	ends
2. Str. 70	18 x 29	522	--	--	--	0	dirt	no
Period 2, 1700– ca. 1730								
3. Str. 1	12 x 28	336	2	4	2	6	dirt	end
4. Str. 10	16 x 32 6 x 8½	563	3	4	8	12	dirt	end
5. Str. 20	12 x 28	336	2	1	0	1	dirt	end
6. Str. KM307	12 x 16	192	?	--	--	0	dirt	no
Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750								
7. Str. 40	12 x 16	192	1	3	--	3	dirt	end
8. Str. 50	16 x 24	384	3	12	6	18	dirt	end
9. Str 107	10 x 10	100	1	--	--	0	dirt	no
Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775								
Str 140	22 x 32	704	2	22	--	22	wood	ends
10. Duplex1	17 x 22	374	1	10	--	10	wood	end
11. Duplex2	15 x 22	330	1	12	--	12	wood	end
12. Str 150	15 x 17†	255†	?	1?	--	1	?	?
13. Str 160	12 x 16†	192†	?	1?	--	1	?	?
				48	16	64		

*brick-lined half cellar †based on indeterminate evidence, these figures will not be used any further

on each end, the total amount of floor space in the Utopia Cottage amounted to 684 square feet.

All but two of the postmolds in the main structure appeared square or rectangular on the surface, suggesting that the builders dressed most of the posts before setting them into the ground. The main structural postholes all were square or rectangular shaped (see Figure 6.1). As for the half-bays on each gable end, four of the six postmolds appeared circular on the surface while two (KM308J and KM308L) on the east end appeared square. All six postholes for the end bays were square shaped, with the two (KM308K and KM308M) that housed the square postmolds being substantially larger than the other four.

Only two of the eight main structural posts showed evidence of repair (see Figure 6.1). Repair post KM306T/V was used to replace KM306L/M. Repairs were also possibly made to KM306N/P, although evidence for this is unclear. None of the six half-bay posts on the east and west ends of the building exhibited any signs of repair.

By comparing the postmold depths of post-in-ground structures it is possible in some cases to infer the manner of construction (see Carson et al. 1981). If postmold depths are similar along the length of a wall it is likely that the prefabricated walls were raised as one unit in a method known as "normal assembly." If pairs of cross-posts have similar depths, this may indicate the building was erected by "tie-beam" or "reverse assembly," meaning two posts opposite one another connected by a horizontal beam (Carson et al. 1981:150; Kelso 1984:61-65). The orientation of the postholes also can confirm the type of construction. For example, rectangular postholes with the long sides parallel to the length of the structure betray reverse assembly, while rectangular posts with the long sides parallel to the width of the building reveal normal assembly (see Carson et al. 1981:150-151).

For the main building core, the depths of the corner posts on the north wall were almost identical to one another, and the corner posts on the south wall differed by one inch. The depths of all four corner posts were within two inches of each other. Kelso argues that the uniformity of the shapes and sizes of the postholes "indicates that the house was razed (sic) and supported by tie-beam timber pairs" (1984:75). Indeed, Kelso is correct to maintain that sizeable postholes were needed in tie-beam construction so the builders could "jockey" the frame, interrupted sills, and braces into place. Yet the shapes of the posts or the locations of the postmolds inside each post fail to provide conclusive proof of the method of construction (see Carson et al. 1981:150-151). Similar postmold depths along the length of the walls suggest normal assembly methods. Thus, exactly how its builders erected the main core of the Utopia Cottage awaits further interpretation.

The depths of the half-bay posts on each gable end also roughly correspond to one another. Since it can be assumed that the three small posts on each end were erected together in a crossbeam unit, the depths of these holes holds less significance than the eight main posts. Although no direct evidence of chimneys was found, Kelso interpreted the half-bays on each end of the building as housing "clay hooded chimneys" probably both 9.0' wide or stretching half the width of the house (see Figure 5.2). The other half of each half-bay probably served as "a chimney pent or closet" (Kelso 1976:3). Kelso suspected that both chimneys were made of wood and lined with clay rather than of brick construction and there seems no reason to doubt his conclusions.³

³ Note, however, that the half bays on the gables are considered livable area for calculating the structure's floor space at 684 square feet (see Table 6.1).

Other than postholes, no architectural evidence of sills, stud posts, scaffolding, chimneys, hearths, or major modifications of the structure were evident. The later addition of a half cellar on the western end of the building lent proof to the likelihood that the dwelling possessed a raised wood floor. Without the half cellar addition the inference of wood flooring would have remained purely speculative. Overall, no evidence has turned up to contradict or revamp the basis of Kelso's original interpretation of the general design of the Utopia Cottage (see Kelso 1984:72-76). The dwelling probably was divided into at least two rooms by a wall near the center of the building, effectively creating a hall and parlor layout (see Figure 5.2). If this is an accurate interpretation, one of the more unusual features of the structure was its two heated ground floor rooms.

Under the floor on the west end of the Utopia Cottage, the residents installed a 12.5' by 15' brick-lined half cellar. Construction of the cellar necessitated digging through a portion of postholes KM306B and KM306S, thereby providing evidence that builders added the cellar to the Utopia Cottage at some point after the structure was standing (see Figure 6.1). The cellar was constructed of high-fired, undersized, red bricks ($7\frac{1}{4}" \times 3\frac{1}{2}" \times 1\frac{1}{2}"$) known as "English paving bricks" (see Figures 5.3 and 5.4). Masons laid the bricks without mortar, chinked together instead with a mixture of sandy orange clay usually $\frac{1}{4}"$ to a $\frac{1}{2}"$ thick between bricks. The walls were laid in English bond, one and a half courses thick. The floor was laid in staggered stretchers throughout. Approximately one-third of the floor and the entire east wall had been dismantled and robbed of brick. In the northwest corner 23 courses of brick remained in place, which extended to a height of 3.75'. The brick floor was 6' below modern grade.

The builders placed a brick-lined sump in the southwest corner, sunken 0.5' below the floor level (see Figure 5.4). The sump was 0.65' by 0.70' in size and positioned at one end of the front of the lowest bulkhead step leading into the cellar from an exterior bulkhead on the west gable end of the structure. The floor was slightly sloped so as to drain toward the sump.

The *insitu* evidence of the bulkhead entrance on the west gable wall of the structure consisted of four brick steps and a partial fifth step. The two top steps were missing, which would have brought the steps up to modern grade. Thus, originally the bulkhead consisted of seven steps. Each step was 0.85' wide (one and a half courses deep) and 0.70' high and each had a wooden nosing. The wooden nosings were 0.10' by 0.35' timbers that fit into sockets built into the sides of the bulkhead. The wooden nosing on the lowest step remained visible, having carbonized in place. The bulkhead sides were laid in stretchers, one half course wide (see Figure 5.4).

Probable Tobacco Barn, Structure 70

Located roughly 130' south and slightly west from the main dwelling, and perched within a few paces of the eroding edge of a cliff bank overlooking the James River, in 1995 archaeologists located Structure 70 (see Figure 5.1). Because of an impeding tree, only seven of the eight structural posts were excavated, leaving the southeast corner posthole unexposed. Nevertheless, Structure 70 proved to have the same dimensions as the core of the main dwelling house, 18' by 29' (as measured from postmold centers) (Figure 6.2). Like the main dwelling, Structure 70 was oriented on an east (29'-wall) to west (18'-wall) axis, only a few degrees out of alignment with the main house. Measurements on the north wall revealed that the building formed three bays, the

two westernmost 10' in length, and the eastern bay roughly 9' in length. Unlike the main dwelling, Structure 70 contained no half-bays on each end.

A comparison of the postmold depths indicates that molds on the long north wall correspond to one another, as do the molds on the long south wall. Thus, postmold depths suggest Structure 70 as raised by normal assembly (long wall units), although the discrepancy between postmold depths in cross pairs was not so great that an almost equally valid argument could be made for reverse assembly. In some cases, the shape and orientation of the posthole and the position of the postmold in each hole provides additional clues about the method of construction (see Carson et al. 1981:150-151). However, none of the postholes in Structure 70 appear to definitively prove normal or reverse assembly based upon their shapes, orientation or dimensions.

Other than the main structural posts, Structure 70 possessed no other visible architectural details (see Figure 6.2). No evidence of chimneys, hearths, or flooring was observed, or any interior features related to the structure. Given the lack of amenities to the structure, an absence of domestic artifacts in and around Structure 70, its location in a separate yard from the main house, it is believed that Structure 70 had a non-domestic use.

Recent studies of 17th- and 18th-century Chesapeake outbuildings can help to provide a context for Structure 70. For instance, Donald Linebaugh surveyed outbuildings associated with 17th-century Chesapeake plantations and found that structures known as "stores" or "storehouses" tended to average under 200 square feet in size (Linebaugh 1994:16-17). Given the 522 square feet of floor space in Structure 70, it would appear that the building was more than twice the size of the average storehouse.

Camille Wells collected architectural data from 18th-century advertisements posted in the *Virginia Gazette* and found most corn cribs and granaries to be generally half the size of barns and tobacco houses, and much closer in size to smokehouses and dairies (Wells 1993:14-23). Wells noted that the majority of 18th-century barns and tobacco houses listed in the newspaper were 20' by 40' in size (800 square feet), bigger than Structure 70, but not extraordinarily different (ibid.:18).

To provide an even more localized context, archaeologists have uncovered a series of utilitarian post-in-ground structures associated with the Littletown plantation during the Pettus and Bray eras that can be compared with Structure 70. The comparative examples from Pettus include probable barns or tobacco houses that ranged in size from 18' by 24' (432 square feet), to 18' by 42' (756 square feet), to 20' by 50' (1,000 square feet) (Kelso 1984:133-135). Similarly, utilitarian structures related to the early 18th-century Bray plantation ranged from 40' by 40' (1,600 square feet), to 20' by 40' (800 square feet), to 19' by 32' (608 square feet) (ibid.:134-136). All these examples from Littletown, and others throughout the wider Chesapeake, strongly suggest that Structure 70 at Utopia functioned either as an animal barn or a tobacco house. And yet, given animal husbandry practices in the late 17th century during Pettus's lifetime which tended to allow animals to forge and roam free, building a structure specifically to shelter animals would have been unusual for its day (see Main 1982; Walsh et al. 1997). Besides, a tobacco crop was much more valuable than livestock and processing it properly and protecting it would have taken precedence over most any animal owned by Pettus. I infer from the evidence that Structure 70 most probably was a tobacco house.

Period 2, 1700 – ca. 1730

The Period 2 occupation at Utopia consisted of four structures, three housing units arrayed in a compound and a smaller non-domestic outbuilding of some sort (see Figures 5.14 and 5.16). An interpretation of various archaeological linkages between the four buildings indisputably indicates that they all stood together at one time; and in fact all four structures probably were erected jointly by James Bray II as he revived the use of Utopia as a quartering site for his slaves in the first decade of the 18th century after a brief hiatus following Pettus II's death.

Housing Unit, Structure 1

Structure 1 was 12' by 28' in size and contained six sub-floor pits, four of them positioned at one end of the building fronting on a dry-laid brick hearth (Figure 6.3; see also Figure 5.16). The dwelling enclosed 336 square feet. Erected on eight main posts, the structure was intended to form two ten foot bays and one eight foot bay. However, the cross-posts for the middle bay were off center by two feet due to the reversal of the post interval on each long wall. On the west wall, the post interval was ten, ten, and eight feet, south to north, whereas on the east wall, the post interval was ten, ten, and eight feet from north to south (see Figure 6.3). With the cross-posts off center, the structure must have been raised in standard side wall units with the joists connecting the side walls to the plate at odd intervals with the upright posts (see Carson et al. 1981). The postmold depths reinforce this interpretation of how the building was raised, with the majority of the postmolds at a similar depth (within an inch or so of each other) along the long walls.

All eight of the postmolds appeared circular in plan, an indication that they were not dressed but rather placed in the ground after stripping off the bark. A few of the main

structural postholes were roughly square in shape, but the majority were irregularly shaped, more circular than square (see Figure 6.3). None of the posts showed any evidence of repair or alteration. Given the irregular size and shape of the postholes and the undressed appearance of the postmolds, the construction of Structure 1 had a rather haphazard appearance as if it were slapped together, perhaps because the carpenter did not care to waste energy on the finer details of carpentry knowing that the building was intended merely for slaves.

Four of the six sub-floor pits were located at the south end of the building around the dry-laid brick hearth. Some of the bricks had been salvaged from the nearby Utopia Cottage. There was no compelling evidence of burning or scorching on the bricks themselves, suggesting that this portion of the hearth that had survived in place was the front of the firebox. The firebox and flue probably were positioned against the gable wall, an area defined by the surrounding sub-floor pits (see Figure 6.3). Coals and ashes could be temporarily raked onto the dry-laid hearth, used for cooking, allowed to cool, and discarded. The position of the cellars in relation to the hearth and the apparent firebox suggests that smoke was drawn up an interior chimney or fire hood affixed to the south gable end. Almost certainly the chimney or hood was wattled and daubed, meaning it was made of scantling and covered with clay to prevent it from burning. Two additional sub-floor pits were located in the center bay (see Figure 6.3).

Aside from the eight main posts, no other evidence of sills, studs, props, partitions, or other structural elements was present. It can be inferred that Structure 1 had a dirt floor based on the fact that the dry-laid hearth rested directly on the ground. Boards or split logs must have been used to cover the sub-floor pits. Although lacking direct

evidence, the house may have been partitioned into two rooms, the so-called hall on the south end, and the parlor on the north. The positions and shapes of Sub-Floor Pits 3 and 5 suggest that they abutted up against a partition wall (see Figure 6.3). If so, the hall would have been 10' by 12' in size, and the parlor 18' by 12'. At least one door on the long east wall probably opened out into the courtyard to the east. A cooking pit was located not more than 15 feet to the east, presumably directly in front of the door (see Figure 5.14). Whether another door on the west side provided cross-passage access remains unknown.

Housing Unit, Structure 10

The basic core of Structure 10 was 16' by 32' in size with a 6' by 8½' shed addition on the east end, providing a total of 563 square feet (Figure 6.4; see also Figure 5.16). On the opposite gable end from the shed a heavy concentration of ash, charcoal, and scorched sand betrayed the location of a hearth and exterior chimney. Apparently, the carpenter planned to divide the structure into two ten foot bays and one 12' bay. Like Structure 1, however, the cross-posts for the middle bay were off center by two feet because of the reversal of the post interval on each long wall. Although it is odd to see the same architectural anomaly imbedded in the plan of both buildings, it may have been purposely duplicated to provide additional structural integrity. Conceivably, posts might have been needed on a closer interval on one side to provide support for a wooden chimney. Whatever the case, this unique structural irregularity in both Structure 1 and Structure 10 strongly suggests that the same carpenter built both buildings.

The postmold depths support the likelihood that the long walls were assembled as units. Most of the postmolds had a distinct square or rectangular shape in plan, indicating

that they were dressed. The postholes also generally were square or rectangular in shape. However there was no uniformity of their axes to indicate how the frame might have been jockeyed into position. Compared to Structure 1, Structure 10 appears to have been built with a bit more care and attention to detail.

One post on the north wall (Post 10n,p) had been extensively repaired. The repair consisted of cutting out the decaying post and refilling the hole with a load of brick bats and a large chunk of fossilized coral. If the structure had an interrupted sill, the sill and remaining post could have rested directly in the bricks and coral. Or a section of new post, in effect a block, could have been wedged into the space, using the bricks and coral like a platform, to provide support to that portion of the wall.

Based on the placement of sub-floor pits inside the building, one door likely was located on the south wall between Sub-Floor Pit 9 and Posthole 10c,d, and opened into the courtyard. Another door likely opened from the shed into a small enclosure built from the corner of Structure 10 to the corner of Structure 20 (see Figure 5.14). The dwelling was partitioned into two 16' by 16' rooms as evidenced by a small weight-bearing post stud located in the center of the building (see Figure 6.4). The west end hall contained only one large sub-floor pit complex fronting a fireplace. By virtue of the location of the sub-floor pit complex nested in the corner of the hall, the hearth and chimney were located on the exterior of the west gable wall (see Figure 6.4). The absence of large quantities of brick and the presence of pieces of clay daubing on top of the sub-floor pit complex indicate that the chimney was wattled and daubed.

The parlor in the east half of Structure 10 contained eight sub-floor pits. Except for Sub-Floor Pit 14, most of the parlor pits were arrayed along the edges of the interior

walls presumably in an effort to keep the main area of foot traffic open and clear of obstacles. Structure 10 had a dirt floor as evinced by the partition post in the center of the building (if there had been a wooden floor the partition post would have been joined into the floor, leaving no archaeological footprint). It can be surmised that loose boards or split logs covered the sub-floor pits.

Housing Unit, Structure 20

The dimensions of Structure 20 were identical to Structure 1, some 12' in width and 28' in length, creating 336 square feet of interior space (Figure 6.5; see also Figure 5.16). Erected on eight main structural posts, in contrast to Structure 1 and 10, the cross-posts in Structure 20 were aligned with each other to form two 10' bays and one 8' bay. The north gable end of the building had been extensively repaired. At some point the entire gable wall on the north end was torn down. Both corner posts on that end were replaced and a center gable post was added on the new repair wall to provide added strength (see Figure 6.5). This repair extended the length of the building by approximately one foot.

All eight of the original postmolds, and the three repair postmolds on the north gable appeared circular in plan, indicating that they were left undressed. Most of the postholes were roughly square or rectangular in shape, with the two corner posts on the south end appearing circular in plan (see Figure 6.5). There appeared to be no uniformity to the orientation or shape of the postholes to provide a clue as to how the structure was put together. However, the postmold depths suggest that normal assembly (long wall units) was employed in the construction of Structure 20. Like Structure 1, as an example of Virginia vernacular architecture, Structure 20 appears to have been poorly executed.

No evidence remained to indicate how Structure 20 was internally divided, if at all. Presumably, like Structure 1, Structure 20 was partitioned into two rooms, a hall and parlor. Conjecture also suggests that a door opened into the courtyard to the west (see Figures 27 and 65). Although no direct evidence of a hearth or chimney was present on the south gable end, due to the extensive repair work on the opposite north gable and the presence of the one sub-floor pit in the southwest corner, it seems likely that the main heat source extended off the south gable corner of the building. Like the dwellings in the compound, it can be surmised that the chimney was made of wattle and daub construction. Other than Sub-Floor Pit 21, no other features were encountered inside Structure 20 (see Figure 6.5). In all likelihood Structure 20 had a dirt floor. This can be partly inferred from the fact that the length of the building was extended by roughly one foot when the north gable was repaired, which would have left a gap between the wall and floorboards. A fence was tied into the northwest corner of Structure 20, forming a small partial enclosure with Structure 10 (see Figure 5.14).

Service Building, Structure KM307

A 12' by 16' structure erected on six posts and which formed two 8' bays was located a short distance south of Structure 20 (Figure 6.6; see Figure 5.14). One of its posts had been extensively repaired. Half of the postmolds (KM307a, c, l) were square shaped and appeared to have been dressed before being raised into place; the other half, including the repair posts, were round and undressed. The postholes were generally square in shape, and large enough to allow the builders to jockey the frame into position, whether it was assembled by normal construction or reverse construction. The absence of

sub-floor pits or evidence of a heat source hint that this structure was not utilized as a dwelling. Instead, it may have served as a service building for storage of farm supplies.

Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750

The Period 3 occupation at Utopia consisted of three structures, two housing units (Structures 40 and 50) with a small service building in between (Structure 107) (see Figure 5.21). Structures 40 and 50 were identical in size when first built suggesting that they were erected at the same time by the same builders. Structure 50 was later doubled in size probably shortly after James Bray III took over ownership of Utopia in 1736.

Housing Unit, Structure 40

Structure 40 was built upon six main structural posts to form a 12' by 16' dwelling divided into two 8' by 12' bays (Figure 6.7; see also Figure 5.22). The structure enclosed 192 square feet of interior space. The posts showed no signs of repair or alteration. The postmolds all appear circular in plan, suggesting that the posts were placed into the holes undressed. The postholes also appeared to be roughly round in plan so that their shape and size did not provide a hint as to how the structure was erected. However, on the south wall all the postmolds were located up against the outer side walls of the postholes, an indication that they were preassembled in a wall unit and lifted into place from the north. In the process, the posts were pushed up against the wall of the posthole. The north wall was positioned into place with the posts centered in the holes, their position dictated by the 12' length of the cross-joists connecting them with the south wall unit. The postmold depths support the interpretation that normal assembly was used to erect Structure 40, with less than three inches difference between post depths on each of the long walls.

Structure 40 contained three sub-floor pits located in front of the hearth and extending into the center of the structure. The position of the pits near the center of the building may have prohibited internal partitioning, although Sub-Floor Pits 42 and 43 could have been positioned up against one side of a center partition wall, with Sub-Floor Pit 41 up against the other.⁴ If this interpretation is correct, Structure 40 may have been divided into an 8' by 12' hall and an 8' by 12' parlor. Archaeologists encountered no direct evidence of a hearth or chimney, however a single fireplace probably was located on one of the gables, most likely the west end, based on the location of the sub-floor pits which appear to be oriented with a hearth. There is some question whether a wattled and daubed clay chimney stack extending off the west end would have impeded foot traffic through a small gate on the west corner of the structure, however the position of Sub-Floor Pit 42 and the others seems to be a more reliable determinant of the fireplace location (see Figure 6.7). The gate allowed entry into an enclosed yard formed by a paling fence tied to the south corners of Structure 40 (see Figure 5.21). Based on the presence of the private yard, it was likely that a door was located on the south wall of the structure for direct entry and egress into the house. A second door on the north wall could have formed a cross passage and provided access to the more public open yard to the north. Presumably Structure 40 had a dirt floor, requiring that the sub-floor pits were covered with loose boards or split logs.

⁴ Archaeologists excavated a test unit into Sub-Floor Pit 43 in the 1970s, covered it with plastic, and the open test unit subsequently eroded and may have been disturbed by children and animals. Therefore, the original dimensions of the feature have been altered, meaning Pit 43 probably did not cross over the projected partition wall (see Figure 6.6).

Housing Unit, Structure 50

The original core of Structure 50 was identical to Structure 40, 12' by 16' in size (Figure 6.8; see also Figure 5.23). Two 6' by 16' sheds later were added to each of the long sides of the building to form a 16' by 24' dwelling divided into three rooms, a central chamber and two wings. The total floor space, with sheds, encompassed 384 square feet. Evidence of a hearth location was absent, however it was likely an impermanent affair made of wattled and daubed clay and centered on the north gable of the original 12' by 16' core (see Figure 6.8). Two possible stud posts (50ac and 50ad) located along the south gable of the original core may be traces of a door jamb. Entrances may have been added to the west and east wings when Structure 50 was expanded.

The postmold depths clearly indicated that normal assembly techniques were applied to the construction of the original core of Structure 50, with the two long walls raised as units. Most of the six postmolds of the original core appeared square or rectangular in plan, indicating that they had been dressed prior to construction of the frame. The postmolds for the shed additions, on the other hand, appeared circular in plan and apparently were not dressed. Most of Structure 50's postholes were roughly square or rectangular in shape, but there was no uniformity to their size or form. None of the posts showed signs of repair or alteration.

Structure 50 contained 18 sub-floor pits, including a complex of pits in the central hall that one researcher has characterized as "the most complicated sequencing of pits excavated to date on a Virginia site" (Samford 2000:94) (see Figure 6.8). This complex alone consisted of 11 sub-floor pits cutting into each other and fronting the hearth on the

north gable. The shed additions contained six sub-floor pits, and the central hall also contained one sub-floor pit not associated with the large complex (see Figure 6.8).

Further study of the sequence of sub-floor pits inside Structure 50 indicates that they were in use in phases, with groups of pits open at any one time (see *ibid.*:98). With sub-floor pits occupying approximately 40 percent of the floor space within Structure 50, it seems highly unlikely that the dwelling had a raised wood floor. Rather, the floor was dirt and allowed relatively easy access for digging pits, and covering them with loose boards or split logs.

Service Building, Structure 107

Structure 107 was located in the yard between Structures 40 and 50 (see Figure 5.21). The small service building was erected on four structural posts to form a building 10' to a side (100 square feet) (Figure 6.9). Other than the four corner posts, archaeologists noted no other architectural details for Structure 107. Based on recorded examples of plantation buildings, Structure 107 was similar in size to dairies, smokehouses, corncribs, and storehouses (see Wells 1993:15-16, 19-20; Linebaugh 1994:16-17). All of these building types ranged between 64 square feet and 256 square feet (*ibid.*). However, dairies and smokehouses often left telltale archaeological signs—dairies often had brick floors, and smokehouses might show evidence of a fire pit for smoking meat or charring. Archaeologists did encounter patches of charred soil in the vicinity of Structure 107, providing a clue that it functioned as a smokehouse. It is highly unlikely that slaves at Utopia would have been dairying, but it is possible that James Bray III or Lewis Burwell IV found it convenient to allow the residents a facility to smoke their own meat. If Structure 107 was not a smokehouse, then it probably functioned as a

corncrib (although 100 square feet was a bit smaller than the average corncrib) or storehouse of some sort.⁵

Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775

The architectural elements of the Period 4 occupation at Utopia consisted of three structures that functioned as four housing units, all apparently erected as log dwellings set on ground-laid sills, piers or blocks (see Figure 5.32). All three structures left only vague architectural footprints. This required the archaeologists to infer most of the details of the dwellings including their size, shape, and other facets of their construction on circumstantial evidence. It is possible that Structure 140 was built first at the site in the early 1750s by Lewis Burwell IV, perhaps to house an overseer, and Structures 150 and 160 were erected a few years later when it was fully transformed into a slave quarter.

Two Housing Units, Duplex 1 and Duplex 2, Structure 140

By the time Structure 140 was built in the early 1750s the carpenters working for Lewis Burwell IV, like most of those in the Chesapeake, had abandoned post-in-ground architecture in favor of log cabins set on ground-laid sills, wood blocks, or brick piers (see Carson et al.:163; Upton 1988:359; Lanier and Herman 1997:63). In the case of Structure 140, the builders dug shallow holes and seated wood blocks at regular intervals. The foundation sill was then set on top of the blocks, raising the structure off the ground by a foot or two. Only traces of four of the wooden piers survived on the south wall of the building (Figure 6.10; see also Figure 5.33). Evidence of the other piers must have been plowed away. Lacking evidence of the full dimensions of the foundation,

⁵ Unfortunately, artifact distribution data provided no recognizable clues as to the function of Structure 107; in fact, the area around Structure 107 was almost devoid of artifacts (see Fesler 2000:19-23).

archaeologists had to estimate the size of Structure 140 by the pattern of sub-floor pits arrayed inside of it. Based on this, the structure was approximately 22' by 32' in size.

All four wooden pier holes were shallow and left indistinct imprints in the ground. However, the spacing of the four surviving pier holes indicates that they were spaced primarily at 5' intervals, with a 7' interval between the southwest corner Pier Hole 39c,d and Pier Hole 37 to make up the 2' difference for the 32' length of the building (see Figure 6.10). Pier Holes 37 and 38 were separated by 15', and a 5' interval separated Pier Holes 38 and 39a,b. Although the evidence of the four vague pier holes do not conclusively prove that Structure 140 was raised off the ground on blocks, a close examination of the divisions between some of the sub-floor pits strongly suggests the location of floor joists that supported a raised wood floor (see Figure 6.10). Many of the sub-floor pits appear to have been dug up against the sides of floor joists, meaning adjacent pits were separated by an 8" to 12" beam. These separations between interior pits also roughly correlate with the locations of the four surviving pier holes on the south wall (see Figure 6.10). Floor joists appear to have been spaced at 5' or 7' intervals. The conjectured interpretation of a wood floor based on the linear spacing between sub-floor pits has been documented elsewhere in the Chesapeake (see May and Deetz 1997).

Although there was no archaeological evidence of hearths or chimneys in Structure 140, concentrations of ash and charcoal in the sub-floor pits located nearest each gable end of the dwelling indicated the presence of two hearths on each gable (see Figure 6.10). Clumps of charred clay in the vicinity confirmed that both chimneys were made with wattled and daubed clay. Given the presence of two end chimneys, it is almost certain that Structure 104 functioned as a duplex and was divided into two

separate housing units (Duplex 1 and Duplex 2) by an internal wall (see Figure 6.10 and Table 6.1). If the design of the building matched other duplexes, there probably was no internal doorway to provide access between the two compartments, or it was permanently blocked to allow privacy for the occupants of each side. Based on the spacing of the pier holes, floor joists, and the positions of the sub-floor pits, especially Sub-Floor Pits 9 and 10 located in the center of the dwelling, the two halves of the duplex were slightly different dimensions. The partition wall must have been located immediately east of Sub-Floor Pits 9 and 10, in line with a floor joist and positioned 17' east from the west wall of the building (see Figure 6.10). This made Duplex 1 in the west half 17' by 22' (374 square feet) in size, and Duplex 2 in the east half 15' by 22' (330 square feet) in size (see Figure 6.10).

The majority of the sub-floor pits form two complexes fronting each hearth in each housing unit. An additional seven sub-floor pits were situated throughout the remaining floor space of the two housing units. To gain access to the sub-floor pits the inhabitants would have had to pull up floor boards and loosely fit them back in place, or perhaps build trap doors through the floor if the wood and hardware was available to them. Based on the positions of the sub-floor pits, the approximate location of floor joists and pier supports, and artifact distribution patterns in the yard, it can be surmised that that doors were located on the south wall for both Duplex 1 and Duplex 2, and perhaps a cross passage door on the north wall for Duplex 1 (see Figures 5.32 and 5.33).

Housing Unit, Structure 150

The only definitive evidence of the presence of Structure 150 was the location of Sub-Floor Pit 4, a 4.0' by 4.5' pit located approximately 12' north of the northeast corner

of Structure 140 (see Figure 5.32). The sides of Sub-Floor Pit 4 were oriented on the same approximate axis as Structure 140 (there was a difference of less than 5 degrees), suggesting that the buildings stood in tandem at some point in time.

Two nebulous features, Features 45 and 46, were located in the vicinity of Sub-Floor Pit 4 and may be remnant stains left by pier hole supports (Figure 6.11). Feature 45 was situated approximately 5' south and 16' east from the southwest corner of Sub-Floor Pit 4 (see Figure 6.11). Feature 46 was located 6' north and 1' west from the northwest corner of Sub-Floor Pit 4. If Feature 45 functioned as the structure's southeast corner pier support, and Feature 46 as the northwest corner pier support, Structure 150 potentially could have been 15' by 17' in size, almost a perfect square (see Figure 6.11). In fact, if indeed Features 45 and 46 were vague pier support stains, the building more likely was 16' square, the length of a rod and a common unit of measurement for carpenters.⁶

Assuming that Features 45 and 46 were pier supports, Structure 150 would have had a raised wood floor. It also is surmised that the single sub-floor pit inside Structure 150 fronted a hearth with a wattle and daub chimney as suggested by the absence of brick or brick bats in the vicinity of the structure or in Sub-Floor Pit 4.

Housing Unit, Structure 160

Located approximately 20' to the north and east from Structure 150, like Structure 150 the only firm evidence of Structure 160 was the location of Sub-Floor Pit 19 (see Figure 6.11). The sides of Sub-Floor Pit 19 were oriented at an angle approximately 40

⁶ Whatever the case may be, unlike Structure 140, the size of Structure 150 is too speculative to be confidently used for any further comparison.

degrees out of sync with Structures 140 and 150, suggesting that Structure 160 was not closely aligned with the other two dwellings.

Located next to the south corner of Sub-Floor Pit 19, Feature 42 may have represented the faint traces of the base of a pier hole support (see Figure 6.11). No other possible pier holes were noted in the vicinity, although two shallow probable non-cultural features (Features 43 and 44) were located along the possible wall line of Structure 160. Although both Feature 43 and 44 had well-defined edges and were circular in plan, excavation proved that they were most likely tree or plant holes and had no immediate relationship to Structure 160 (see Figure 6.11).

Without any corroborating architectural details, one can only estimate the possible dimensions of Structure 160. It would appear that Sub-Floor Pit 19 was located in the south corner of Structure 160, probably fronting a hearth and chimney extending off the gable. Presuming that the 6' width of Sub-Floor Pit 19 approximated the width of the fireplace, it can be supposed that the gable was twice that length, perhaps 12'. The building might have been as much as 16' long, identical in size to Structure 40 and the original core of Structure 50 from the Period 3 occupation, and a common size for slave quarters of this era (see Glassie 1975:22-40). The 12' by 16' dimensions of Structure 160 are merely an educated guess based almost entirely on conjecture, and therefore will not be used for any further comparisons.

If Feature 42 was the south corner pier support for Structure 160, the dwelling had a raised wood floor. The lack of brick or other evidence of a masonry chimney would seem to indicate that the heat source for Structure 160 once again was a wattled and daubed clay chimney.

This review of the structural form and character of the Utopia housing units illustrates that several important architectural changes occurred at the site. The most dramatic architectural difference affecting the quality of life inside the housing units concerned the changes in flooring. The original Period 1 Utopia Cottage had a wooden plank floor, possibly added to the dwelling when the brick-lined half cellar was installed. The next two generations of Utopia residents did not have the luxury of a wood floor under their feet. However, by Period 4 the dwellings were raised off the ground and set on piers, reintroducing the benefits of wood flooring to the final residents of the site.

The average size of the eight measurable housing units at Utopia was 400 square feet (see Table 6.1). A comparison of the eight housing units indicates that unit size diminished appreciably between Periods 1 to 3, and then marginally increased in Period 4 (Table 6.2). The Period 1 Utopia Cottage (684 square feet) was more than twice the size of the average housing unit in Periods 3 and 4 (320 square feet). Nearly a 25 percent reduction in average housing unit size also occurred between Period 2 and the latter two periods, and a nearly 50 percent drop between Period 1 and Period 4 (see Table 6.2). Overall, there appears to have been a considerable decrease in the size of the quarters

Table 6.2. Average Utopia housing unit size, by period.

	All Eight Housing Units	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4
Average Square Feet	400	684 ^a	412 ^b	288 ^c	352 ^d

^a Based on one housing unit, the Utopia Cottage, and possible closets or interior chimneys as livable space.

^b Based on three housing units, Structures 1, 10, and 20.

^c Based on two housing units, Structures 40 and 50.

^d Based on two housing units: Duplex 1 and Duplex 2 in Structure 140; not Structures 150 or 160.

used to house slaves at Utopia.

Changing Structures throughout the Chesapeake

Although the history of the Utopia Quarter was not unlike other slave quarters of the same size and duration, the general decline in house size at Utopia may have been an isolated phenomenon. The trend toward smaller quarters at Utopia is based on only eight housing units (six dwellings and a duplex). A data set of 63 additional slave quarters in the Chesapeake region, spanning from the late 17th century to the mid-19th century (ca. 1660 – ca. 1860) has been collected and combined with the Utopia data in an effort to determine if the development of smaller quarters was a widespread occurrence. Including Utopia, the full dataset examined here contains 73 slave quarters, all identified and studied archaeologically (Appendix E) (Figure 6.12).⁷

Data has been collected on the size of the structural footprint (as measured in square feet) for each of the housing units in the dataset. The size of six of the 73 dataset structures—Utopia Structures 150 and 160, Curles Neck, Poplar Forest North Hill, Mount Vernon House for Families, and Richneck Structure B—could not be determined or reasonably estimated, reducing the dataset to 67 cases. The mean for the 67 cases is 352 square feet with a median of 336 square feet (Table 6.3). The sizes range from the mammoth 1,152 square foot Kingsmill Quarter Structure 1 to the miniscule Piney Grove Structure 5 at 33.75 square feet (see Table 6.3 and Appendix E).

A box-and-dot plot of the dataset illustrates that the distribution of the data values is skewed upward (Figure 6.13). Two of the cases—Shirley Plantation House A at 800

⁷ The dataset contains no standing examples or above-ground structures.

Table 6.3. Descriptive statistics for housing unit size (in square feet).

Number of Cases	$\bar{x}$	Median	Standard Deviation	Variance	Minimum	Maximum
67	352	336	194	37,596	33.75	1152

square feet and Carter's Grove House B at 850 square feet—are outliers, and the 1,152 square foot Kingsmill Quarter Structure 1 is an extreme outlier. Given the presence of these three outliers causing upward skewing, a square root transformation was applied to the dataset (Figure 6.14), producing a more symmetrical distribution, and one less vulnerable to statistical error.

To compare the changes in housing unit size across time, I divided the years between 1660 and 1860 into eight different temporal subgroupings labeled as “Periods” (Table 6.4).⁸ Period A contains all eight temporal subgroups and is the most sensitive of the periods, but the least responsive to statistical tests. Periods B, C, and D are divided into halves. For Period B a date of 1760 was chosen as a midpoint. Based on theories developed by James Deetz, the year 1760 marks a moment of cultural transition as well as a decade of political and economic turmoil that eventually led to the American Revolution (Deetz 1996). Agricultural shifts also began in earnest at this time as planters began to diversify their crops (Breen 1985), the flow of African slaves into Virginia had greatly diminished, the majority of Virginia's slaves were native-born, and demographic imbalances had largely stabilized (Curtin 1969; Menard 1977). Therefore, 1760 is considered a significant dividing line from which to view change on either side of it. The midpoint for Period C is moved up to 1780 as a comparison with Period B. Change,

⁸ The dataset contained no cases from the initial period, 1660 to 1680.

Table 6.4. Frequencies for nominal categories for period of occupation.

Code #	Period A (Case, %)	Period B (Case, %)	Period C (Case, %)	Period D (Case, %)
1	1660-1680 (0, 0%)	1660-1760 (30, 41%)	1660-1780 (43, 59%)	1660-1800 (60, 82%)
2	1680-1700 (3, 4%)	1760-1860 (43, 59%)	1780-1860 (30, 41%)	1800-1860 (13, 18%)
3	1700-1720 (9, 12%)			
4	1720-1760 (18, 25%)			
5	1760-1780 (13, 18%)			
6	1780-1800 (17, 23%)			
7	1800-1830 (7, 10%)			
8	1830-1860 (6, 8%)			
	(73, 100%)	(73, 100%)	(73, 100%)	(73, 100%)

Code #	Period E (Case, %)	Period F (Case, %)	Period G (Case, %)	Period H (Case, %)	Period I (Case, %)
1	1660-1720 (12, 16%)	1660-1760 (30, 41%)	1660-1780 (43, 59%)	1660-1700 (3, 4%)	1660-1720 (12, 16%)
2	1720-1780 (31, 43%)	1760-1800 (30, 41%)	1780-1800 (17, 23%)	1700-1760 (27, 37%)	1720-1760 (18, 25%)
3	1780-1860 (30, 41%)	1800-1860 (13, 18%)	1800-1860 (13, 18%)	1760-1800 (30, 41%)	1760-1780 (13, 18%)
4				1800-1860 (13, 18%)	1780-1860 (30, 41%)
	(73, 100%)	(73, 100%)	(73, 100%)	(73, 100%)	(73, 100%)

including house size, may have occurred later than 1760, perhaps marked by the end of the American Revolution around ca. 1780. And Period D moves the midpoint even further to 1800 (see Table 6.4).

Periods E, F, and G are divided into three chronological subgroups, parsing different portions of the mid-18th century around the 1760 midpoint in an attempt to capture change on either side of the middle subgroup (see Table 6.4). Periods H and I are structured into four subgroups as another method of tracing when housing unit size might have changed.

By placing the 67 measurable housing units into the Period A subgroups it becomes apparent that over time a general reduction in the size of slave quarters occurred in the group (Table 6.5). Average house size prior to 1720 was more than 420 square feet, and fell below 200 square feet by 1800, rising again above 300 square feet in the final decades leading up to the Civil War. Between 1680 and 1830 the size of an average housing unit trended downward except for the 1760 to 1780 period.⁹ Housing unit size diminished by nearly 60 percent from the 1680 to 1720 period to the 1800 to 1860 period. The median also expresses the reduction in housing unit size for every period except the last (see Table 6.5). Tracking the mean over time, there is an increase in unit size in the 1760 to 1780 period and in the final period between 1830 and 1860 (Figure 6.15); otherwise there is a gradual drop in the average size of housing units. The trajectory of the median is smoother, and for a group of 61 cases with a five-percent trimmed mean, the downward trajectory is steadier still and lacks the second spike in the 1830 to 1860

⁹ The average for the 1760–1780 period is radically effected by an extreme outlier, the 1,152 square foot Kingsmill Quarter Structure 1. Without it, the period's average drops to 392.

Table 6.5. Summary of housing unit size for Period A.

Code #	Period A	Sq. Ft. All Cases			
		N	$\bar{x}$	Md.	St. Dev.
1	1660-1680	0	0	0	0
2	1680-1700	3	432	390	78
3	1700-1720	9	421↓	384↓	138
4	1720-1760	17	348↓	384	120
5	1760-1780	9	476↑	360↓	290
6	1780-1800	16	311↓	249↓	189
7	1800-1830	7	186↓	168↓	161
8	1830-1860	6	333↑	250↑	246
		67	352	336	194

period (see Figure 6.15).

To further investigate the apparent reduction in the average size of slave housing units eight analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were applied to the square root transformed dataset. A Null Hypothesis for each of the ANOVA tests stated that housing unit sizes for the various subperiods of each test were equal. For six of the eight tests the Null Hypothesis was rejected, meaning that housing unit size was not equal and the difference between the size of housing units over time was significant at the 95 percent confidence level ($\alpha = .05$).

Tests B, C, and D were performed on pairs of temporal subperiods on either side of a midpoint at 1760 (Test B), 1780 (Test C), and 1800 (Test D) (Table 6.6). For each of the three tests the size of an average housing unit decreased (see Table 6.6). For two of the tests divided at 1780 and 1800 the difference observed in housing unit size between the two temporal subperiods was significant (see Table 6.6). However, for Test

B the difference between housing unit size in groups on either side of 1760 proved to be not significant (see Table 6.6). These ANOVA tests suggest that only after 1780, and not before, did a significant difference in the average size of slave housing units occur.

Table 6.6. ANOVA tests for housing unit size, Periods B, C, and D.

1. Test B (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	2. Test C (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	3. Test D (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$
1660-1760 (29)	19.21	1660-1780 (38)	19.66	1660-1800 (54)	18.88
1760-1860 (38)	17.25	1780-1860 (29)	16.05	1800-1860 (13)	14.84
F = 2.616	p = .111	F = 9.805	p = .003	F = 7.619	p = .007

Tests E, F, and G were conducted on groups divided into three temporal subperiods (Table 6.7). Average housing unit size decreased over time for all three tests, and all three indicated that the difference in housing unit size between the three subperiods was significant (see Table 6.7). A Scheffe's pairwise multiple comparison test was executed to identify between which subperiods significant variability existed. The Scheffe's test flagged a significant difference between subperiods #1 and #3 for all three tests, and a significant difference between subperiods #2 and #3 in Test E. Based on these results, the ANOVA tests on the dataset divided into three subperiods reiterates that 1780 was a watershed moment for the decreasing size of slave quarters, and by 1800 the reduction in size was complete.

Two final ANOVA tests were run on groups divided into four temporal subperiods (Table 6.8). Although for Test H average housing unit size grew smaller over time, the difference in size between the four subperiods was not significant (see Table

Table 6.7. ANOVA tests for housing unit size, Periods E, F, and G.

1. Test E (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	2. Test F (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	3. Test G (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$
1. 1660-1720 (12)	20.40	1. 1660-1760 (28)	19.47	1. 1660-1780 (38)	19.66
2. 1720-1780 (26)	19.32	2. 1760-1800 (26)	18.25	2. 1780-1800 (16)	17.04
3. 1780-1860 (29)	16.05	3. 1800-1860 (13)	14.84	3. 1800-1860 (13)	14.84
F = 5.078	p = .009	F = 4.244	p = .019	F = 5.750	p = .005

6.8). For Test I unit size did not progressively diminish for the four subperiods, however the difference in the means was significant (see Table 6.8). According to a Scheffe's test, no significant variations occurred between any of the sub-periods in either Test H or Test I. Although statistically inconclusive, both tests suggest, again, that housing unit size at Chesapeake slave quarters changed around 1780, and were manifest by 1800.

Table 6.8. ANOVA tests for housing unit size, Periods H and I.

1. Test H (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	2. Test I (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$
1660-1700 (3)	20.73	1660-1720 (12)	20.40
1700-1760 (26)	19.03	1720-1760 (17)	18.37
1760-1800 (25)	18.50	1760-1780 (9)	21.11
1800-1860 (13)	14.84	1780-1860 (29)	16.05
F = 2.696	p = .053	F = 4.119	p = .010

The ANOVA tests demonstrate fairly conclusively that the average size of slave housing units grew smaller over time. The descent in size was not perfectly linear, but persistent and occurred throughout the 18th and into the 19th century (see Figure 6.15). A conservative interpretation of the data indicates that the average slave quarter in 1680 was 100 square feet larger than one in 1860 (see Figure 6.15). A more liberal interpretation might conclude that the typical slave housing unit in the 19th century was half the size of those in the late 17th and early 18th centuries (see Figure 6.15 and Table 6.5). The statistical tests indicate that quarters built before 1780 were significantly larger than those built after 1780.

Architectural Change and Slave Families at Utopia and the Chesapeake

The average housing unit size at Utopia is 400 square feet, and the average housing unit in the dataset (not including the Utopia structures) is 345 square feet.¹⁰ A recent study of plantation buildings listed in the *Virginia Gazette* mostly between 1750 and 1800 indicated that the average slave quarter was 345 square feet (Wells 1994:16). An independent survey of 31 possible standing slave quarters from throughout Virginia ranging from the 18th century to the mid 19th produced an average size of 371 square feet (Upton 1982). Thus, it would appear that by the mid-18th century the average Chesapeake slave quarter was approximately 350 square feet, what amounted to a 16' by 22' structure. Fifty years earlier the average slave quarter was more than 400 square feet, roughly 18' by 24' in size, and by the early 19th century the average size had dropped to approximately 200 square feet, something like a 12' by 16' cabin.

¹⁰ Note that if the floor space for the Utopia Cottage is reduced to 522 square feet (by eliminating the possible chimney/closets on each end), and Structures 150 and 160 are conservatively estimated each to be 200 square feet, the average Utopia housing unit comes out to be 344 square feet.

Although the reasons for this significant change in the size of slave quarters can be attributed to a variety of factors, the most likely explanation is the accommodation of the emerging slave family. This is almost certainly what triggered the reduction of the housing units at the Utopia Quarter. In the 1680s Thomas Pettus II housed both slaves and servants in a large, modestly equipped house. With more than 600 square feet of living space plus a half cellar with a bulkhead entrance, and two large fireplaces on each gable end, the dwelling was as good or better than the homes of most free people. Servants and slaves potentially could have segregated themselves in each half of the structure, occupying the house as if it was a duplex. Or they may have felt no compunction about sharing domestic spaces, as was relatively common at the time. Documents hint that perhaps two slave couples resided at Utopia by the early 1690s.

In the first decade of the 18th century James Bray II built a compound of three quarters at Utopia. Ranging in size from 336 square feet to 563 square feet, all three housing units were large enough to serve as group residences for an enslaved African workforce.¹¹ However, Structure 10 was considerably larger than Structures 1 and 20, and because of this, it alone may have been used as a barracks, whereas the other two units could have been built with a smaller group in mind. Yet, the layout of the site—both inside and out—bespoke of a communal atmosphere, something with which most of the African members of the community would have been comfortable. The daily social interaction that occurred in this type of setting may have hastened the process of family formation at Utopia. Whatever the case, large dwellings that could accommodate a dozen

¹¹ The limited number of English indentured servants that Bray owned lived elsewhere.

or more slaves were in use at Utopia for the first three decades of the 18th century.

By the 1730s, the first houses at Utopia constructed specifically for smaller groups of slaves, presumably family or kin groups, appeared on the landscape. Built under the ownership of Thomas Bray II or his son James Bray III, two houses enclosing a mere 192 square feet were erected at the site. One of the houses, Structure 50, was enlarged to double its original size to 384 square feet probably around the year 1740 to accommodate newly purchased Africans. Thus, for a time, Virginia-born slaves and incoming Africans both resided at Utopia, and were housed differently. James Bray III apparently opted to place new Africans in a cramped barracks, while providing an autonomous housing unit for a smaller group of creoles. The Period 3 occupation at Utopia, therefore, illustrates a process of architectural transition with the co-existence of private quarters and dorms at the site.

In the 1750s and 1760s new quarters again were built at Utopia under the direction of its final owner Lewis Burwell IV. This time it appears as if none of the houses were intended to function as barracks. Instead, Burwell constructed a duplex with compartments of 374 and 330 square feet, both with a large fireplace for cooking and warmth. Two additional dwellings were placed near the duplex, both probably under 300 square feet in size. The total floor space of the duplex amounted to more than 700 square feet, and it could have served as an immense group residence. But Burwell was faced with a different slave population than his predecessors. He purchased only an occasional new African, relying instead on his slaves to increase their population through childbirth, meaning almost all of his slaves were native-born creoles. Because of this, it was to Burwell's advantage, and met the wishes of his slaves, to quarter them in discrete housing

units whose membership was limited to family members. Although it was large enough to be used as a barracks, Burwell probably never considered using Structure 140 as such. Instead, the duplex served the housing needs of two different groups kept under one roof. The emergence of the duplex provided a transitional link between the earlier barn-like barracks and the later diminutive cabins; in form the duplex was virtually identical to a barracks, but in function it was more akin to a single-family cabin.

Figure 6.1. Main housing unit (KM306/KM308), the Utopia Cottage, Period 1 Utopia.

Figure 6.1. Main housing unit (KM306/KM308), the Utopia Cottage, Period 1 Utopia.

Figure 6.2. Tobacco barn, Structure 70, Period 1 Utopia.

Figure 6.3. Structure 1 housing unit, Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 6.3. Structure 1 housing unit, Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 6.4. Housing unit, Structure 10, Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 6.5. Housing unit, Structure 20, Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 6.6. Service building, Structure KM307, Period 2 Utopia.

Figure 6.7. Housing unit, Structure 40, Period 3 Utopia.

Figure 6.8. Housing unit, Structure 50, Period 3 Utopia.

Structure 107

Figure 6.9. Service building, Structure 107, Period 3 Utopia.

Figure 6.10. Housing units, Duplex 1 and Duplex 2, Structure 140, Period 4 Utopia.

Figure 6.11. Housing units, Structures 150 and 160, Period 4 Utopia.

Figure 6.12. Location of comparative Chesapeake slave sites.

Figure 6.13. Box-and-dot plot for 67 Chesapeake slave housing units as expressed in square feet.

Figure 6.14. Box-and-dot plot for square root transformed dataset of 67 Chesapeake slave housing units.

Figure 6.15. Chart of mean and median housing unit size over time for 67 cases and 61 trimmed mean cases.

CHAPTER VII.

SUB-FLOOR PITS AND THE SLAVE FAMILY

This morning we had a complaint about a butter pot's being taken . . .
[so] I sent Billy Beale to search all their holes and boxes.

Landon Carter, 1770

While the physical size of Chesapeake slave quarter housing units diminished throughout the 18th century and into the 19th century, the use of space inside the houses changed as well. Most interior elements such as the locations of sleeping palettes or beds and other furnishings, storage spaces, shelves, closets, partitions, even the location of doorways or the most rudimentary floor plan leave no archaeological traces. This is especially so for any slave cabins with wood flooring. Frequently archaeologists are left to imagine and infer from the outer shell of the structure—usually nothing more than a rectangular box formed by between six and ten postholes—how the interior spaces of slave cabins might have been organized (see Chappell 1994:205).¹ However, beginning in the latter decades of the 17th century, many Chesapeake slaves adopted a distinctive method of expanding the useable space within their quarters by digging small cellars into the floors of their dwellings. Historical archaeologists have excavated several hundred of these sub-floor pits on Chesapeake slave sites, ranging from cubby holes the size of a shoe box, to pits that could have accommodated a large chest of drawers (see e.g., Kelso 1984; Kimmel 1993; Neiman 1997; Samford 2000). These sub-floor pits² represent the most significant, and usually the only, archaeological source of information concerning

¹ For cabins set on shallow ground laid sills or piers there usually is no architectural footprint whatsoever after the site has been plowed, leaving the artifacts distributed in the plowzone as the sole indication of the presence of a dwelling.

² Throughout this chapter the term “sub-floor pit” frequently will be abbreviated as “pit” and “SFP” after the first reference in a given paragraph.

the interior organization of a slave quarter.

Like changes in the size of slave quarters over time, changes in the quantity and configuration of sub-floor pits within those quarters has the potential to provide a glimpse into the evolution of the Chesapeake slave family. The groundwork for this chapter can be found in two important recent studies, one in the form of a paper delivered at the annual Society for Historical Archaeology conference in 1997 by Fraser Neiman, the other a dissertation focused on slave quarter sub-floor pits in pre-Revolutionary Virginia written by Patricia Samford (2000). Essentially, Neiman engages the social ramifications of SFP storage, ferreting out the cultural logic of this type of storage strategy, whereas Samford comprehensively surveys and examines the forms and functions of pits to reach similar conclusions about their uses and meanings.

Neiman's 1997 conference paper outlined a behavioral interpretation of sub-floor pit use among Chesapeake slaves from an evolutionary perspective. He proposed that the essential factor that determined the quantity of SFPs in a given slave dwelling was "the extent to which residence groups are comprised of kin and the extent to which unrelated individuals are able to control residence-group membership." Simply put, in the late 17th and early 18th centuries groups of coresiding, unrelated slaves living in a cramped environment were apt to generate more pits than later households, perhaps just as cramped, but composed of presumably trusted family members. According to Neiman, SFPs were an adaptive response to crowded living quarters where they functioned as "safe-deposit boxes" that provided the dual benefits of privacy and security for one's belongings. The need for safe-deposit boxes diminished over time as the membership of an increasing number of slave households consisted of kin, thereby lessening the need to

protect one's belongings from theft or tampering. Neiman found that within his sample of Chesapeake slave sites "the frequency of sub-floor pits occurrence drops dramatically with the emergence of kin-based housing," something that transpired ca. 1790 in his estimation (*ibid.*).

Samford's study also focused on the uses of sub-floor pits by enslaved Africans, this time by comparing their various forms and functions (2000:29-30). She surveyed more than 100 SFPs in Virginia, including those at Utopia, and concluded that they served a range of purposes, from personal storage, to root cellars, and in some instances as religious shrines. To reach her conclusions Samford conducted a thorough review of the sizes, shapes, depths, structural elements, placement, and contents of SFPs, in the process identifying consistent patterns for some of these variables that had a direct influence on their function. Samford found that hearth-front pits were used primarily as root cellars or for other food storage, whereas pits located elsewhere in a structure were used for a variety of tasks including personal storage. A few pits with intact caches of artifacts set on top of platforms of soil potentially functioned as religious shrines, according to Samford's interpretation, offering evidence of African religious practices.

Neiman's premise that the amount of sub-floor pits in Chesapeake slave quarters decreased over time in accord with the emergence of family and kin-based living units, linked with Samford's work on the specific forms and functions of the pits, provides an archaeological opportunity to test family formation processes among Chesapeake slaves. Like the reduction of housing unit size, presumably the changing amount of pits in slave dwellings acted as a rudimentary gauge of group composition. Quarters with many SFPs likely represent group lodging, with each resident acting individually, whereas housing

units with fewer SFPs signal the presence of families and kin forming cooperative households and sharing pit space.

Of all the archaeological components making up a slave quarter, sub-floor pits may be the purest archaeological form of self-determination, a physical demonstration of enslaved residents molding their living environment without interference from authority figures. The vast majority of slave owners decided the types and sizes of the quartering houses built for their enslaved laborers. Witness mid-18th-century planter Joseph Ball determining the dimensions and construction materials for dwellings built for his slaves, even setting the pitch of the roof and the thickness of planking in the loft (see p. 233). An owner also controlled most other material elements of a slave's world. Ceramics, cooking utensils, clothing, bedding, personal belongings, furnishings, and much of the food was meted out at the discretion of an owner, and usually in short supply. Thus, the simple process of digging a hole into one's floor represented a degree of autonomy not visible in other forms of slave material culture. At the very least, digging a pit was an attempt to organize a living space, not unlike building a closet or adding an addition to a contemporary home. And slaves made these decisions free from planter control. Chesapeake slave quarters were not routinely inspected or visited by planters unless a crime was committed, and in fact evidence suggests that the slave quarters were off limits to authority figures under normal conditions (see Fithian 1957:88; Upton 1988:367). Unlike slave quarter architecture where the size of the housing unit influenced the social discourse that took place inside, the presence (or absence) of sub-floor pits does not appear to have played a central role in shaping slave families. For example, the presence of numerous pits in a housing unit did not condition the type of group living in

the house. Rather, SFPs were the product of social organization of the group living within a housing unit, the effect of the cause, a physical manifestation of people establishing relationships, and moving from disordered coresidential groups to cooperative households.

Aside from Neiman's conference paper (1997), few historical archaeologists have attempted to trace the evolution of the sub-floor pit at Chesapeake slave quarter sites or linked any changes to the development of slave kin and family groups. Instead, studies of SFPs have concentrated on establishing African cultural origins for the pits, debated their functions, and documented their forms (see Kelso 1984:200-204; Sprinkle 1991a, 1991b; Yentsch 1991b; Sanford 1991; Mouer 1991; Chambers 1992; Kimmel 1993; May and Deetz 1997; Samford 2000).

The remainder of this chapter will consider the changes in the types and the quantity of sub-floor pits both at the Utopia Quarter and throughout the Chesapeake as reflective of changes over time in the membership of coresidential groups and households. First, the archaeological background and current interpretation and understanding of SFPs are recapped and their emerging importance as artifacts of Chesapeake slave life is reviewed. Second, the 64 SFPs excavated at Utopia are evaluated. Instead of discussing all 64 pits in detail, the groups of SFPs encountered in nine housing units at Utopia are assessed in an effort to characterize the pitting strategy or "profile" of each unit. Third, an analysis is conducted on 269 SFPs compiled from a dataset of 73 slave quarters located throughout the Chesapeake region (including the Utopia pits). The emphasis of this analysis is on the changing quantity and density of pits per housing unit between ca. 1680 to ca. 1860 with an expectation that a decrease in the

amount of SFPs within slave houses signaled a change in the composition of the residents living inside. A final section of the chapter reviews the findings and provides an overview of the relationship between SFPs and the changing Chesapeake slave family.

The Historiography and Archaeological Interpretation of the Sub-Floor Pit

The discovery of sub-floor pits in Chesapeake slave contexts had an inauspicious beginning. In the mid-1960s historical archaeologist Ivor Noël Hume excavated what he believed were several square 18th-century "trash pits" under the floor of a brick kitchen at Tutter's Neck in James City County, Virginia, what he later identified as sub-floor pits (1968:45-49). Several years later William Kelso uncovered a group of 13 square boxes in the ground at Carter's Grove, again in James City County, and interpreted them as tanning pits or possibly military latrines (1972:33-41). Kelso went on to conduct major excavations in the mid-1970s at a dozen 17th- and 18th-century colonial sites at Kingsmill plantation just up river from Carter's Grove (see Figures 1.7 and 4.3). Eventually as more of these curious "boxes" turned up at Kingsmill, Kelso recognized a consistent pattern, that the boxes were small below-floor cellars and they "almost invariably" were present at documented slave quarter sites appearing in every 18th-century slave quarter context at Kingsmill (1984:104). Kelso also noted, "The fact that these small pits do not appear on the preslavery sites may be more convincing evidence that they are indeed the product of black culture" (ibid.:105).

Observing that many of the small cellars at Kingsmill were located near hearths, Kelso interpreted their function as "root cellars," for storing and preserving potatoes and other tubers that would otherwise spoil in the winter cold (1984:105). Due to the amount

of food remains and animal bones in the root cellars, Kelso also proposed that slaves used them to conceal pilfered food and other stolen goods. He hypothesized that most slave owners were unaware of the presence of root cellars in the slave quarters and therefore they acted as convenient hiding places for supplies and materials illegally acquired by slaves (ibid.:201). Kelso's work at Kingsmill introduced "root cellars" into the historical archaeological lexicon and established them as a definitive component of African-American culture in the Chesapeake.³

Given the strong association of sub-floor pits as artifacts of slave life, some archaeologists in the 1980s and 1990s began to consider their presence on undocumented sites as *prima facie* evidence of slave settlement. Like colonoware pottery, decorated local clay tobacco pipes, glass beads, cowry shells, charms, crystals, and pierced spoons, SFPs were construed by some as exclusively related to African Americans, either produced by them, linked to West or Central African cultures, or having special spiritual and symbolic meaning to them (see Klingelhofer 1987; Brown and Cooper 1990; Ferguson 1992; Patten 1992; Pearce 1993; Stine et al. 1996; Franklin 1997:217-256; Emerson 1994, 1999; Leone and Fry 1999; Samford 1999, 2000; Galke 2000; Fennell 2003). Although many of these artifacts had importance to some slaves, other historical archaeologists began to look more critically at these "Africanisms" and question whether enslaved Africans were the only people producing, using, or possessing such artifacts (Mouer 1991; Sanford 1991; Kimmel 1993; Deetz 1995; Fesler 1995; Fesler and Franklin

³ Kelso's use of the term "root cellar" for all sub-floor pits was quickly adopted by the historical archaeological establishment. However, the name implies an explicit function for the pits, that of root storage and preservation. Research has proven that the pits were put to other uses, so a more neutral term references their form as "sub-floor pits" and is used throughout this discussion.

1999:3-4; Mouer et al. 1999). In terms of SFPs, scholars began to question whether "rectangular holes in front of hearths are sufficient to indicate African-American occupation" (Kimmel 1993:102). Further research proved that belowground storage pits occurred in widely varied cultural settings including Europe, European colonies including North America, some Plains and Eastern Woodland American Indian groups, and parts of West Africa (Mouer 1991; Yentsch 1991b; Kimmel 1993:103-104; Chappell 1999:244; Samford 2000:17-20). As Neiman has pointed out, sub-floor pit storage is employed in a wide variety of cultural settings throughout the world because it is, in his words, "a good trick" (1997).

Yet the historical and demographic evidence linking slaves with the emergence of sub-floor pits is difficult to dismiss (Fesler 1997b; Samford 2000:19-23). Like Kelso, Samford points out the most obvious and strongest supporting argument, that "the increased appearance of pits on sites coincides with the rapid expansion of the Virginia slave trade" (2000:23). Indeed, although a few SFPs purportedly have been found that predate ca. 1680 (e.g., Mouer 1993:150), they only begin to appear in significant numbers after 1680 when the numbers of enslaved Africans entering the colony rose precipitously. And, of course, preliminary studies indicate that pit use declined in the latter 18th century in conjunction with changing coresidence patterns at slave quarters (Fesler 1997b; Samford 2000:22). Hypothetically, by the American Revolution Chesapeake slaves living among kin no longer needed to rely on a good trick to solve their storage problems. However, sub-floor storage did not disappear altogether. There is a growing amount of evidence that African Americans continued the tradition of sub-floor storage after emancipation and into the 20th century, in the process solidifying the practice as an

African-American convention (see Mouer 1991; Westmacott 1992:82-83; Samford 2000:24-25).

While sub-floor pits can be found in almost all corners of the globe, their presence in such large numbers on Chesapeake slave sites suggests that the conditions of enslavement prompted slaves to adapt the practice of sub-floor storage until it became equivalent to an indigenous cultural tradition. The only documented historical account of African sub-floor storage comes from an early 19th-century English sea captain visiting an Igbo culture area in what is now present-day Nigeria, who noted that some of the residents "bury under the floors of their houses" some of their more valuable belongings (see Yentsch 1991b). This one description represents the totality of ethnographic support for an African use of belowground storage. Furthermore, if SFPs were an African cultural antecedent, it is difficult to reconcile the fact that archaeologists have yet to uncover a single SFP in a slave context in South Carolina, Georgia, or Florida.⁴

Ecological, environmental, demographic, and cultural explanations have been proposed to explain the regional differences regarding pits. For one, milder temperatures in the Lower South may have made underground storage of most root crops unnecessary.

Samford concluded that all the environmental, historical, and cultural factors in combination probably contributed to the presence of SFPs in the Chesapeake, and their absence in the Lower South (2000:24). Moreover, historian Philip Morgan has observed that, as a rule, Lowcountry slave houses "proved somewhat more substantial than their

⁴ Sub-floor pits have been found on plantations in North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and as far as the Mississippi Delta, all primary destinations for the mass migration of Chesapeake farmers and their slaves in the late 18th and 19th centuries, suggesting that Chesapeake slaves were the source of the custom and "carried this cultural practice with them to these new areas" (Samford 2000:24).

Chesapeake counterparts," further suggesting that slaves in that region were more apt to use attached or nearby sheds for general storage (1998:110, 116-117). If Morgan's assertions are correct, coupled with cultural and environmental variations between the regions, Lowcountry slaves may have not needed to rely on a good trick to organize spaces in their houses.

As several scholars have recently proposed, differences in the origins of slaves traded to the Chesapeake and to the Lowcountry could have caused sub-floor pit usage in one area, and its absence in another (Chambers 1991; see also Samford 2000). A theory has been developed that SFPs were a specific cultural convention related to Igbo culture in the Lower Niger River delta region of West Africa, especially due to an Igbo reliance on yams as a dietary staple, and thus the invention or reinvention of "root cellars" once under enslavement (Chambers 1991; see also Samford 2000). Igbos represented a sizeable percentage of the Chesapeake transatlantic slave trade, sometimes more than half the arrivals into the region (Chambers 1991, 1996; Walsh 2001), and certainly this culture group had an overriding influence on the development of African-American culture in the Chesapeake. However, as of yet, there is no convincing ethnographic, documentary, or archaeological evidence of the "Igboization" of sub-floor pit technology.⁵ The theory awaits more support.

A more persuasive explanation for sub-floor pit usage by so many Chesapeake slaves can be reached by considering them as a response to the conditions of enslavement, a solution to a problem, rather than the application of an Igbo cultural

⁵ Historian Douglas Chambers believes that Igbos had such a pervasive cultural impact in the Chesapeake that they "Igboized" or imposed their cultural values on the region (1996:401).

practice known from a life before slavery (see also Samford 2000:29). Although SFP storage was available to all sectors of society, only Chesapeake slaves were compelled to elaborate the practice into a custom. Indeed, no other segment of Chesapeake society had the practical need to perpetuate SFP storage generation after generation. A house crowded with children and extended family members was familiar to many social and cultural groups, both black and white, but only slaves were confronted with living in such an environment with strangers. Thus, SFPs solved two dilemmas that faced slaves: congested living spaces, and a lack of privacy and personal security. Sub-floor pits were a mechanism of survival for slaves, a way to parcel out limited spaces inside their homes and to protect belongings from other residents (see Neiman 1997).

Sub-Floor Pit Form

Sub-floor pit construction required little or no expertise. All one needed was a desire to create a useful subterranean space, an instrument to dig, and material to cover it. The size, shape, capacity, and elaboration of SFPs varied considerably from place to place, as well as the degree of effort and detail invested in them, and the materials devoted to their upkeep. The most common type of pit literally consisted of a hole in the ground covered by boards, split logs, or some other type of covering that could be removed easily for access and quickly replaced. Sometimes the pits may have remained open with a table, bed, or other furnishing set overtop (see Samford 2000:27).

The matter of how slaves covered sub-floor pits continues to be something of a mystery. Plowing has occurred on most Chesapeake archaeological sites, effectively removing any intact evidence of the tops of most of them. Historical archaeologists have surmised that ledges were used to seat boards or other coverings into the ground so they

would sit flush with the surface of the dirt floor (see Samford 2000:26-27). It seems to have depended on the type of material placed over the pit. Split logs probably were sunk into the ground, whereas hewn boards could have been laid across the open pits more easily. In either case, effectively covering the pits seems to have been a chronic nuisance and inconvenience.

The one trait that almost all sub-floor pits shared was a short lifespan. The archaeological evidence indicates that they were susceptible to collapse. The constant stress caused by foot traffic, rodents or other vermin undermining the walls, as well as erosion and groundwater seepage all contributed to the instability of pits. In part the vulnerability of a pit to these breakdowns was contingent upon the type of soil in which it was located. In those coastal areas with sandy, friable soils, collapsing walls and other failures were a common occurrence, whereas in areas with a clay soil matrix the SFPs were more durable, although still at risk for some of these perennial problems.

The integrity of a sub-floor pit could be prolonged by taking several measures. One strategy simply involved placing pits adjacent to an interior wall, in a corner, or otherwise out of the high traffic flow areas of a house. Slaves implemented this approach most often for pits intended primarily for personal storage. In the majority of these cases nothing was done to reinforce the sidewalls or line the floor—the pit simply consisted of a hole cut into the earth, usually to a depth of the underlying clay subsoil or slightly deeper. Some SFPs exhibited evidence of scorched walls and floors, perhaps in an attempt to dry out or harden the walls and floor to protect against collapse (Samford 2000:25). On occasions the floors and walls were lined with boards or in rare instances with brick (ibid.:25-26). And in a few cases prefabricated wooden boxes with hinged lids

were lowered into holes and soil packed in around the edges, analogous to a chest and in embedded in the ground (*ibid.*; see also Sprinkle 1991a, 1991b). *ibid.*:146). In addition,

Even those pits reinforced with wood or brick were susceptible to failure eventually. In housing units with raised wooden floors the durability of sub-floor pits was improved due to the fact that the edges of the pits did not bear the weight of foot traffic, but instead were protected between floor joists. However, the space between the underside of the floor and the top of the pit was vulnerable to animal intrusions, puddling, and erosion. In virtually every setting SFPs required regular attention and maintenance in an ongoing battle against the forces of nature that threatened to destroy them.

Samford studied the form and physical characteristics of a group of 103 sub-floor pits from three sites in James City County, including Utopia and found several noteworthy patterns and trends (2000:142).⁶ She noted a strong correlation between the location of a SFP and its likelihood of repair, noting that nearly 80 percent of the pits located in front of hearths had been repaired at least once, whereas roughly 20 percent of those located elsewhere within a structure showed evidence of repair (*ibid.*:145). From this Samford suggested that if repairs indicated the importance of a particular location within a housing unit, "hearth fronts were highly valued positions for pits" (*ibid.*).

Samford also examined the shapes of sub-floor pits. Grouping pits into three categories—oblong (length greater than width), square, and round—Samford discovered that 85 percent of the SFPs in her dataset were oblong in shape (2000:145). Pit shape also varied by location. Oblong pits predominated, but were almost always located along

⁶ The sites also included Kingsmill Quarter and Carter's Grove (see Kelso 1972, 1984).

walls or in the center of rooms. Square pits were most common in front of hearths and in corners, and round ones were almost always placed in corners (ibid.:146). In addition, Samford found that on average hearth-front pits were larger in size and deeper than any other pits (ibid.:146-149). However, the range of sizes and depths for hearth-front and corner pits was significantly less than other types, prompting Samford to conclude that hearth and corner pits "served specialized functions that required a specific range of surface area or depth" (ibid.:149). Overall, from her assessment of pit forms Samford made a strong case for the likelihood that "pit location was perhaps related to pit function within the household" (ibid.). Indeed, consistent differences in the sizes, shapes, depths, and locations of pits within slave quarter housing units indicate that they served a variety of purposes.

Sub-Floor Pit Functions

Based on the variety of forms, archaeologists have proposed at least half a dozen different feasible functions for sub-floor pits. Among these, some SFPs may have functioned as sources of clay borrow pits during construction, as "hidey holes" for concealing goods, as religious shrines, as food storage units, or as personal storage cellars (see Kelso 1984:200-204; Sprinkle 1991a, 1991b; Yentsch 1991b; Sanford 1991; Mouer 1991; Chambers 1992; Kimmel 1993; May and Deetz 1997; Samford 2000). Almost all the functions of SFPs that have been suggested and interpreted appear to have a degree of truth to them. The SFP was adaptable enough and simple enough to serve multiple purposes; in fact, there is reason to believe that individual pits were modified to perform multiple functions over time. Even Samford's hypothesis that a few SFPs served as religious shrines traceable to Igbo cultures in West Africa is more than plausible based on

the evidence (2000).⁷

Interpreting a pit's function is highly dependent upon its preservation and its archaeological context. All artifacts recovered from archaeological deposits represent cultural activity, but archaeologists have come to recognize that, depending on the type of deposition, some artifacts are capable of providing more information than others. In the case of sub-floor pits, most were transformed into archaeological features by one of two ways: they were purposefully backfilled with soil obtained from the immediate environs around the house, or they silted in naturally after the housing unit was abandoned. In both these cases the pits will contain secondary refuse (see Schiffer 1987:58-59). Less frequently archaeologists might encounter SFPs containing primary refuse, artifacts deposited at the location of their use.

The most significant and informative form of archaeological deposits have come to be labeled "de facto refuse," meaning useable artifacts that were left in place when the sub-floor pit or the site was abandoned (Schiffer 1987:89-90). For obvious reasons de facto refuse artifacts have the highest archaeological value and represent the most direct connection with past cultural activity (see Samford 2000:165-166, 175-176). Although uncommon, SFPs containing de facto refuse are the most prized archaeological feature found on Chesapeake slave sites.

What would prompt an individual to abandon useable goods in a sub-floor pit? The most common explanation was when fire destroyed a building and the burned debris permanently sealed the contents of any pits in use at the time. Sudden abandonment of

⁷ At Utopia Samford found credible evidence that at least four of the sub-floor pits could have functioned as shrines (ibid.:206-214).

the building could also prompt a resident to forget to empty a pit, or perhaps rare examples of flooding or a calamitous episode of siltation could cause artifacts to be left in place. In any of these scenarios examples of de facto refuse in sub-floor pits are few and far between, meaning the vast majority of artifacts recovered from SFPs can be categorized as secondary refuse. This realization complicates the process of interpreting the function of SFPs for in almost all cases the only de facto component is the empty pit itself.

Sub-Floor Pits as Clay Borrow Pits

Based on inference and a few 19th-century references to the use of clay in the construction of slave cabins, sub-floor pits may have been dug originally to extract clay for use in lining wood chimneys, chinking the gaps between logs, or other structural purposes (Kimmel 1993:105-107; see also Samford 2000:150-152). The hastily excavated clay borrow pits later could have been reshaped into useable SFPs.

Theoretically, at least, some SFPs may have begun as borrow pits. However, there exists almost no way to prove that SFPs were born as borrow pits, and that fact has little or no bearing on the eventual function of the sub-floor pit. Secondly, the presence of borrow pits in the yards of slave quarters would seem to vouch for the fact that most carpenters did not feel it was necessary to dig up the floor of the house as it was being built.⁸ Moreover, for framed structures with brick chimneys, like the Kingsmill Quarter, there was no need to borrow for clay (Samford 2000:152).

⁸ See for example Periods 3 and 4 at Utopia (see Figures 5.21 and 5.32).

Sub-Floor Pits for Concealment

When William Kelso recovered wine bottles, coins, intact tools, and ceramic vessels in some of the sub-floor pits he excavated at a slave quarters at Kingsmill plantation, and earlier at one at Carter's Grove plantation, he had uncovered a small number of examples of de facto refuse artifacts (Figure 7.1). Few archaeologists have been so lucky. With many of the artifacts still resting on the pit floor in their original positions, Kelso initially interpreted these findings as evidence that slaves used pits as hiding places to conceal illegally acquired goods from a slave master or overseer (Kelso 1972, 1984:201). His interpretation of pits as "hidey holes" was based in part on an attempt to make sense of the apparent stores of seemingly valuable items that slaves were not expected to have access to or openly possess (Kelso 1984:201). Citing a handful of documentary references that slaves sometimes secreted stolen goods under the floors of their houses, Kelso probably was correct to interpret a few isolated examples of SFPs at Kingsmill and Carter's Grove as covert hiding places (*ibid.*; see also Samford 2000:164-165). However, the majority of SFPs have not produced an archaeological confirmation of this function, nor is there any way to prove that goods, no matter how potentially valuable, were stolen.

Sub-Floor Pits as Religious Shrines

Based on archaeological and ethnographic evidence of West African spirituality, Patricia Samford's extensive study of Chesapeake sub-floor pits has led her to propose that "some of the sub-floor pits found in Virginia slave quarters functioned as West African-based personal and ancestor shrines" (2000:167). Samford developed a series of contextual suppositions to distinguish SFP shrines beginning with the concept that

"complete and useable objects would not have been forgotten or intentionally discarded" (2000:173). Rather, shrines were private, sacred, and would have been left intact, even after abandonment of the building. To support her theory Samford carefully cataloged the sizes and internal locations of artifacts in more than 100 pits, hypothesizing that those with complete or nearly complete objects located on or near the pit floor represented de facto deposited caches of artifacts (ibid.:175-177). In this manner Samford interpreted caches of artifacts in four of the SFPs at Utopia as religious shrines. SFP 9 in Period 2 contained a grouping of artifacts such as an iron hoe, a wine bottle body containing bone and eggshell, and other artifacts in one corner on its floor (ibid.:207). SFP 44 from Period 3 had an earthen platform with complete scallop shells, animal bones, and complete tobacco pipebowls that suggested to Samford its use as a shrine (ibid.:207-212). In Period 4 Samford interpreted the cache of iron tools, a brass candlestick, cufflinks, a bone handled knife, and clay marbles in SFP 8 as having religious significance (ibid.:212-214). And the complete copper frying pan with a complete wine bottle in it in, along with other items in SFP 10 in Period 4 suggested to Samford that it too functioned as a shrine (ibid.:214-215). Although controversial and generating some skepticism among her colleagues, her arguments are compelling and I am persuaded that certain enslaved Africans used sub-floor pits as religious shrines.

Sub-Floor Pits for Food Storage

The body of historical literature describing the food storage properties of sub-floor pits is short and incomplete. What historical records are available make mention of the practice, but fail to describe in any detail the overriding philosophy of subterranean food preservation or the finer points of how it was accomplished. However, underground

storage of fruits and vegetables is a folkway still in practice today in some rural areas. In her research Samford discovered a small collection of modern instruction manuals and contemporary guidebooks about underground storage of foodstuffs, and these outline at least the general principles behind the use of what are commonly known still today as "root cellars" (see Samford 2000:157).

Current discussions indicate that temperature and humidity are the most important variables that must be monitored in a root cellar (Samford 2000:159). Like a thermostat, the temperature in a root cellar can be adjusted depending on its depth. The ideal depth to maintain cold storage temperature stability in a root cellar is ten feet (ibid.). Realistically, the deepest sub-floor pits recorded thus far at a Chesapeake slave quarter site are approximately half that, meaning temperature stability inside the pits must have been a perennial problem. Yet there were ways to improve the efficiency of root cellars by placing them in corners out of direct sunlight, and covering them tightly to block out even diffuse light (ibid.:159-161).

Humidity levels inside a root cellar also must be carefully monitored. High humidity can trigger spoilage in most produce and generate mold and fungus spores which can destroy fruits and vegetables (Samford 2000:159). Humidity can be adjusted by placing open containers of water in the pit, or by packing stored produce in moist sawdust, peat moss, or other types of damp packing material (ibid.). By carefully monitoring and adjusting the temperature and humidity controls for a root cellar, and maintaining a stable environment, various types of produce can be stored and preserved for prolonged periods of time.

By trial and error slaves must have learned to find a balance between temperature

and moisture levels depending on the type of produce they were attempting to store.

Adjustments in temperature and humidity could be made by changing the depth, interior location, and contents of a pit. For example, some root vegetables such as white potatoes, turnips, and beets require cold conditions (32–40° F) and high humidity, meaning a deep pit located in a corner or away from a heat source would have been the ideal. Apples, pears, cabbage, and cauliflower do better with less humidity, suggesting a pit intended for these types of produce could be located closer to a heat source. On the other hand, pumpkins, sweet potatoes, tomatoes, and squash need a dryer environment and warmer temperatures to preserve well, indicating that a hearth-front location and only moderate depth was the most important factor (Samford 2000:159-160).

Based on the modern literature the form of a root cellar—its depth, location within a structure, shape, and design—largely dictated its function. Deeper pits placed at a distance from the fireplace were an attempt to approximate a refrigerated environment for certain types of fruits and vegetables, whereas pits fronting a hearth could be used to keep food stores needing a dryer, warmer setting, particularly to protect sweet potatoes and other tuberous plants in the winter (Samford 2000:189). Not all sub-floor pits placed in front of the fireplace may have been used to store food, but with the hearth acting as the locus of food preparation and cooking activities, the association is difficult to dismiss. Lacking proper materials and the ability to attentively control the interior environment, the success of root cellar storage in a typical slave quarter must have been fraught with difficulties. And yet, however inefficient and crude, the overwhelming numbers of them suggest that even a poorly functioning root cellar must have been better than none at all.

cellars for food storage

Hearth-Front Sub-Floor Pits as Root Cellars

Of all the possible uses for sub-floor pits the best documented accounts refer to pits as root cellars. Perhaps the most widely referenced historical description, and one of the earliest, comes from Robert Beverley's *History and Present State of Virginia* written in 1705. Describing how potatoes were stored over the winter, Beverley observed that "People bury 'em under Ground, near the Fire-Hearths, all the Winter, until the Time comes, that their Seedlings are to be set" (1705 [1947]:145). Notably, Beverley was describing this practice among Native American groups, suggestive that African Americans and Anglo Americans learned the techniques of root cellar storage from them. Samford has uncovered 17th- and 18th-century gardening manuals that advise burying vegetables underground to preserve them from freezing (2000:154). The only three extant 19th-century descriptions of root cellars are African-American accounts, again primarily in reference to protecting potatoes from freezing temperatures (ibid.:154-155). Thus, based on the handful of historical descriptions, the primary function of SFPs was as root cellars, chiefly to preserve potatoes and other tuberous vegetables from spoiling over the winter.

Samford pursued paleobotanical analysis of soil samples collected from the floors of four sub-floor pits at Utopia and found evidence in hearth-front pits for cereal grain storage in them, in addition to other foodstuffs, as well as the likelihood that the hearth-front pits were lined with grasses to enhance a stable storage environment (2000:189-196; Cummings and Montoux 1999). Samford's research provides the strongest archaeological proof to date that the primary function for hearth-front SFPs was as root cellars for food storage.

Isolated Sub-Floor Pits for Cold Storage

Although there are no known historical accounts of sub-floor pits for cold food storage, some of the deeper pits located in corners or at a distance from a heat source may have served as makeshift coolers for keeping some foods in a cool environment (Figure 7.2). As mentioned, certain types of fruits and vegetables preserve well in a cold air setting, particularly if packed in materials that promote cooling. It is even possible, at least in theory, that deeper pits were used for dairying.⁹ The chances of maintaining a functioning cold storage pit in the summer months are remote. However, in certain seasons it may have been possible to engineer a temporary cold storage sub-floor pit. Future ethnobotanical studies of these types of pits, or the chance discovery of *de facto* refuse in one may provide the conclusive proof of this use.

Sub-Floor Pits as Personal Storage Cellars

The difference between sub-floor pits used to conceal stolen goods and for personal storage is probably a matter of interpretation. For example, there is no method to definitively confirm whether the *de facto* refuse in some of the SFPs excavated at Kingsmill Quarter was illegally attained or not (see Figure 7.1). Whether acquired on the sly or with permission, an essential function of SFPs was to store and protect personal belongings. While the function of SFPs for food storage was contingent upon their form, "personal storage pits could be as individual as the persons creating them" (Samford 2000:205). Indeed, for pits not fronting the hearth, the variety of shapes, sizes, and

⁹ However, dairying presents a problem in pits with un-reinforced sides, especially deep pits that would have required reaching down into them, putting stress on the side walls and causing soil granules to drop on the contents inside. Moreover, dirt and dust from the floor would have been kicked into the pits, falling through cracks in the slats covering them or along the edges.

locations seems to attest to the fact that form had little to do with function (see *ibid.*:267).

Again, the archaeological identification of those sub-floor pits used exclusively or primarily for personal storage is a problem of context. Of the several hundred SFPs that have been excavated, more than 90 percent of them contained secondary refuse, making an interpretation of their function almost impossible, at least on an individual basis. Yet, among archaeologists who have addressed the issue, the general consensus is that the majority of SFPs identified at slave quarter sites were used for personal storage (see Kelso 1984:200-204; Sprinkle 1991a, 1991b; Yentsch 1991b; Sanford 1991; Mouer 1991; Chambers 1992; Kimmel 1993; May and Deetz 1997; Neiman 1997; Samford 2000).

Samford has made the most definitive statement regarding functional differences of sub-floor pits (2000). She has come to the conclusion that hearth-front pits were mainly used for food storage generally functioning as root cellars, whereas pits arrayed throughout other areas of a housing unit were intended for personal storage, or in some instances were used as sacred spaces (*ibid.*:267-269). Depth and size also appear to be significant variables. Deeper pits allowed for better temperature and humidity control, factors that determined the success or failure of a pit used for root or food storage. Moreover, deeper pits had a greater volume of storage capacity. It is difficult to imagine expending the time or energy to dig a personal storage pit several feet deep or large enough to hold an object the size of a wheelbarrow. Conversely, if the objective was to store and protect a crop of sweet potatoes over the winter months, enough volume was needed to properly keep the entire crop in a stable environment.

The functional distinction between hearth-front pits and others is significant

regarding positioning, depth, and volume, however once this distinction is made, further interpretation of individual pits becomes difficult, especially considering that nine out of ten sub-floor pits contain secondary refuse. However, analyzed as a group, the SFPs within a particular structure represent a storage strategy that can provide interpretive clues to the character of the group living inside. Housing units with only one or two SFPs present a different collective SFP "profile" compared with units containing a dozen or more pits. An illustration of these differences can be found in the comparison of the sub-floor pit storage profiles for nine of the slave quarter housing units at Utopia.

Sub-Floor Pitting Practices at the Utopia Quarter

Excluding the half cellar in the Period 1 Utopia Cottage which does not fit the definition of a sub-floor pit, a total of 64 sub-floor pits were excavated at Utopia from within nine separate housing units (Table 7.1). Slightly more than half (52 percent, $n=33$) of the pits were located in front of hearths, whereas the remainder (48 percent, $n=31$) were placed in other areas of the buildings (see Table 7.1). In the process of their use some of the original pits were filled and re-dug, sometimes two, three, or even four times, leaving only a small portion of the original fill for archaeologists to excavate, or perhaps entirely obliterating earlier pits. The SFPs in each housing unit are discussed as a group of cohesive components that represent social and functional decisions made by the residents.

Period 1, ca. 1675 – 1700

No hand-dug sub-floor pits were present at the Period 1 occupation of Utopia (see Table 7.1). As discussed in the previous chapter, the only subterranean storage feature consisted of a dry-laid, brick-lined half cellar added to the main dwelling house after it

Table 7.1. Sub-floor pit totals in nine housing units at the Utopia Quarter.

Structure	Total Sub-Floor Pits	Hearth-Front SFPs	Non-Hearth-Front SFPs
Period 1, ca. 1675 – 1700			
Utopia Cottage	*		
Period 2, 1700– ca. 1730			
Structure 1	6	4 (67%)	2 (33%)
Structure 10	12	3 (25%)	9 (75%)
Structure 20	1	1 (100%)	0
Period 2 Totals	19	8 (42%)	11 (58%)
Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750			
Structure 40	3	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
Structure 50	18	8 (44%)#	10 (56%)
Period 3 Totals	21	10 (48%)	11 (52%)
Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775			
Structure 140-1	10	6 (60%)	4 (40%)
Structure 140-2	12	7 (58%)	5 (42%)
Structure 150	1	1 (100%)	0
Structure 160	1	1 (100%)	0
Period 4 Totals	24	15 (63%)	9 (38%)
Site Totals	64	33 (52%)	31 (48%)

* Brick-lined half cellar not included in sub-floor pit tabulations.

Note that three SFPs technically located in the vicinity of the hearth are categorized as “non-hearth-front pits” in terms of function.

had been in use for several years. Some 12.5' by 15' in size, and 6' deep, the half cellar does not fit the archetypal definition of a sub-floor pit, and therefore will not be included in any further discussions of the topic.

Period 2, 1700 – ca. 1730

Sub-floor pits first appear at Utopia in three housing units associated with the Period 2 occupation of the site (see Figure 5.14). Archaeologists identified 19 of them, eight of which were considered hearth-front pits, and 11 located in other areas within the

housing units (see Table 7.1). Twelve of the pits were located in Structure 10, half that number in Structure 1, and only a single SFP in Structure 20 (Table 7.2).

Table 7.2. Sub-floor pits at the Utopia Quarter, Period 2, ca. 1700 – ca. 1730.

	Position	Shape	Phase	Dimensions & Depth (in feet)	Cubic Area*	Total Artifacts	Artifacts Per Cubic Foot	Volume Ratio of Space
Structure 1								
SFP 30	Hearth	Rect	1	3.0x2.8x1.0	8.4	566	67.3	.025
SFP 6	Middle	Rect	1	4.2x4.75x0.8	15.96	26	1.6	.048
SFP 5	Wall	Rnd	2	2.9x1.1x0.7	1.75	213	121.7	.005
SFP 2	Hearth	Rect	2	4.8x3.5x1.1	18.48	2128	115.2	.055
SFP 3	Hearth	Rect	2	3.3x5.4x0.9	16.04	2462	153.5	.048
SFP 4	Hearth	Rect	2	3.5x2.8x1.4	13.72	976	71.1	.041
Totals					74.35	6371	85.7	.221
Structure 10								
SFP 15	Corner	Rect	1	3.6x4.5x0.8	12.96	650	50.2	.023
SFP 16	Wall	Rect	1	3.0x4.7x0.9	12.69	428	33.73	.023
SFP 17	Wall	Rnd	1	3.5x2.2x0.8	4.84	190	39.3	.009
SFP 27	Middle	Rect	1	1.8x2.3x0.4	1.66*	85	51.2	.003
SFP36T/Y	Hearth	Rect	1	3.5x2.2x2.25	17.33*	1216	70.2	.031
SFP 35	Wall	Rect	1/2	2.1x4.8x0.3	3.02*	252	83.4	.005
SFP 9	Wall	Rnd	1/2	4.5x2.9x0.9	9.22	1347	146.1	.016
SFP 14	Middle	Rect	1/2	4.6x3.7x0.9	15.32	1795	117.2	.027
SFP 18	Wall	Rnd	2	2.3x2.3x0.25	1.04	191	183.7	.002
SFP 32	Wall	Rect	2	3.9x2.6x0.3	3.04	155	51.0	.005
SFP 36	Hearth	Rect	2	4.5x4.5x1.6	32.4	5447	168.1	.057
SFP 37	Hearth	Rect	3	5.7x1.7x1.0	9.69	792	81.7	.017
Totals					123.21	12548	101.8	.218
Structure 20								
SFP 21	Hearth	Rect	1/2	6.0x4.5x1.25	33.75	8726	258.5	.100
Totals					33.75	8726	258.5	.100

*Cubic area is projected and does not represent the total amount of fill excavated.

Table 7.2 summarizes the pertinent information for each Period 2 sub-floor pit. Each pit was designated into one of four different possible positions in a housing unit—fronting a hearth, along a wall, in a corner, or in the middle of the floor space. For structures with multiple SFPs, especially those partially or completely cutting through each other, basic phases could be determined. In addition, some sequencing could be determined by comparing the volume of artifacts recovered from the unintruded pits. Some pits with large quantities of artifacts (almost always from secondary refuse) were assumed to be later in the sequence, presumably because more time had elapsed for artifacts to accumulate around the housing unit, and thereby become backfilled as secondary refuse. Pits with a smaller volume of artifacts most probably were filled earlier in the sequence, coming from midden soil containing less debris. At least two phases of pitting occurred in Structure 1, and perhaps three in Structure 10 (see Table 7.2). Using Samford's classification method for shape, pits were characterized as rectangular (oblong), square, or round (see Samford 2000:145). The dimensions and depths of each SFP are provided, and from that cubic area was calculated.¹⁰ Finally, the volume ratio in the far right column of Table 7.2 represents the ratio of cubic feet of pit space to square feet of housing unit floor space.¹¹

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 1

Structure 1 contained six sub-floor pits; four of them positioned in front of a dry-laid brick hearth, the other two in the center bay of the house (see Figure 6.3). Five of the

¹⁰ For those pits later truncated by a second or third pit, cubic area was calculated for its original size, and does not represent the actual amount of fill that was excavated by archaeologists.

¹¹ For example, SFP 2 contained 18.48 cubic feet, divided by the area of Structure 1 (336 square feet) providing a figure of .055, meaning SFP 2 provided 5.5 percent of Structure 1's storage volume.

six pits were rectangular in shape; only a round SFP 5 differed from the norm. In fact, all the pits were similar in size, shape, depth, and dimension except for SFP 5 which was smaller than the others, shallower, differently shaped, and placed along the west wall (see Figure 6.3). SFP 2 was the largest pit in terms of cubic storage space, closely followed by Pits 3, 6, and 4, respectively (see Table 7.2). SFP 3 produced the most artifacts per cubic foot, while SFP 6 was virtually devoid of artifacts. Overall, by volume, 22.1 percent of Structure 1's floor space was devoted to sub-floor pit storage, the majority of it in hearth-front pits.

It would appear that at least two phases of sub-floor pitting occurred in Structure 1. SFP 30, and probably SFP 6 were dug during an initial phase, and later the complex of Pits 2, 3, and 4 were positioned around the hearth during a second phase of pitting, and SFP 5 appears to have been added later as well. During the first phase Pit 30 was positioned in front of the firebox, probably used for food or root storage. Pit 6 may have served as a personal storage space, located near the center of the unit. It contained a small number of artifacts, suggesting it was filled early in the sequence (see Table 7.2).

The second phase of pitting involved placing three pits of similar size and depth in close proximity to the dry-laid hearth and firebox (see Figure 6.3). The positions of Pits 2, 3, and 4 indicate a classic example of root cellar usage and an attempt to keep the contents of these pits dry, warm, and at a constant temperature (see Figure 6.3). These three root cellars appear to have been created at the same time, their sizes only restricted by the width of the housing unit.¹² It is possible that Pits 2, 3, and 4 originally were

¹² The north wall of SFP 3 may have abutted up against a partition wall (see Figure 6.3).

intended to store and protect harvested sweet potatoes or similar crop over the winter (see Samford 2000). Based on the heavy volume of artifacts, Pit 5 appears to have been generated during this second phase, tucked out of the way in a corner in the center bay, and used for personal storage (see Figure 6.3 and Table 7.2). With four of the six pits devoted to root/food storage, an activity that presumably benefited all members of the housing unit, and only two pits with earmarks of personal use, the SFP profile for Structure 1 suggests the inhabitants were sharing most, if not all, storage spaces and cooperating in their living arrangement.

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 10

Over its lifetime the residents of Structure 10 dug a dozen sub-floor pits (see Table 7.2). The housing unit was divided into two 16' by 16' rooms to form a hall in the west and a parlor in the east (see Figure 6.4). Three pits formed a complex located directly in front of the hearth in the hall. All three pits were rectangular in shape and oriented to the fireplace that extended off the west wall of the structure. SFP 36 dominated the complex (see Figures 5.15 and 7.3). The pit consisted of a 4.5' by 4.5' wooden box set into the hole. Traces of its wood walls were discovered in place as well as a large hinge which proved that at one time the box had a lid (Figures 7.3 and 7.4). Compared to the other pits in Structure 10, this one was the most securable. Not only could the box have been locked to prevent theft, but the walls and lid probably kept out most vermin, making it an ideal place to store and protect food. Based on an interpretation of the soil stratigraphy inside Pit 36, it appears that it was destroyed when the house's chimney caught on fire (see Figure 7.4). During the process of extinguishing the fire, the lid to the box collapsed and a portion of the brick hearth fell into the hole.

The residents filled the open pit quickly, dug a shallow fire pit on top of it, and converted it into a crude heat source (see Samford 2000:82-83).

SFP 36 was by far the largest pit in Structure 10 by volume, and produced several times over the amount of artifacts compared to the other two hearth-front pits in the housing unit (see Table 7.2). Pit 36T/Y, the pit that was replaced by Pit 36, provided approximately half the storage space of its predecessor (see Table 7.2). Pit 37, the third hearth-front pit, was much shallower and had less available storage capacity. The three hearth-front pits provided almost half ($n=59.42$ cubic feet) of the 123.21 cubic feet of storage space on hand in Structure 10.

Nine sub-floor pits in Structure 10 had no apparent functional relationship to the hearth. A single non-hearth-front pit (Pit 35) was present in the hall, adjacent to the south wall of the structure.¹³ Eight SFPs were placed in the parlor in the east half of the building, distributed mainly along the north and south walls, except for SFPs 14 and 27 extending out into the center of the room. SFP 15 extended into a small shed addition on the far east end of the structure (see Figure 6.4). Three of the parlor pits were round, and the other five were rectangular in shape (see Table 7.2). All eight parlor pits were relatively shallow, less than 1.0' in depth. SFP 14 had the largest volume of space among the parlor pits and was one of the richest in terms of artifacts. Only Pits 15 and 16 neared its storage volume, and only Pits 9 and 18 produced more artifacts per cubic foot than Pit 14 (see Table 7.2). A perfect 2.3' circle, but only 0.25' in depth, SFP 18 was the smallest pit in Structure 10 with barely 1.0 cubic feet of storage space. The nine non-hearth

¹³ Although in the vicinity of the hearth-front pits, Pit 35 was very shallow and positioned more than 6.0' from the hearth, making it an unlikely candidate for a pit intended for root or food storage, especially considering it was located adjacent to a probable doorway (see Figure 6.4).

related pits supplied slightly more than half ($n=63.79$ cubic feet) of the total sub-floor storage space in the building.

Although twice as many sub-floor pits were present in Structure 10 ($n=12$) compared to Structure 1 ($n=6$), the volume of cubic space devoted to SFP storage was almost identical at 21.8 percent (see Table 7.2). And like Structure 1, two main phases of SFPs could be identified in Structure 10. In front of the hearth SFP 36T/Y was dug first, followed in sequence by Pit 36, and lastly Pit 37 which appears to have been dug after Pit 36 had collapsed and been transformed into a fire pit (see Figure 6.4). Elsewhere the sequence of pitting is less clear. Pits 18 and 32 cut through earlier pits (Pits 15 and 27, respectively), and therefore comprise a second phase of pitting. Pit 35 is cut by Pit 37, placing it in the first or second phase. Otherwise, Pits 9, 14, 16, 17 are unintruded, making an attribution to a particular pitting phase difficult. By default these four pits are included in the initial pitting phase. However, the artifact density of Pits 9 and 14 is comparatively high, suggesting that they may have been dug later in the life of the housing unit (see Table 7.2).

Overall, the three hearth-front pits fit the criteria—substantial depth and volume, proximity to the hearth—for food or root storage. The other nine pits appear more random, and lack depth and any consistent size, shape, or pattern suggesting that each was dug by an individual seeking to create personal storage space. Structure 10 seems to represent the classic model of sub-floor pit use with hearth-front pits massed together in front of a heat source to serve a specific purpose, and other pits haphazardly placed throughout the remainder of the housing unit for more personal purposes. Moreover, in terms of the relationships taking place inside Structure 10, the SFP profile has the

characteristics of a coresidence. With multiple pits arrayed throughout the housing unit, the pattern seems to reflect a resident group of solitaires competing for storage space, protecting personal goods from one another, and only cooperating warily.

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 20

SFP 21 was the only interior feature in Structure 20 (see Figure 6.5). Positioned in front of a gable end chimney extending off the south end of the building, nearly 3.0' separated the front lip of Pit 21 and the edge of the firebox, a probable indication that there was a brick hearth surface between them. Roughly rectangular with rounded corners, Pit 21 contained the largest volume of space among the 19 Period 2 pits at 33.75 cubic feet (see Table 7.2). SFP 21 also produced the heaviest volume of artifacts for any of the Period 2 pits at more than 250 per cubic foot. Although the only pit in Structure 20, Pit 21 alone accounted for 10 percent of the cubic space, by volume, available in the building (see Table 7.2).

According to the stratigraphic layering inside Pit 21, it may have been filled in two distinct episodes. Several inches of soil (Layers H and J) may have been deposited in the open pit and used as a bed of sorts for storage items, and then later the remainder of the pit was filled with secondary refuse (Figure 7.6). Whatever the case, as a sizeable hearth-front pit of considerable depth, the function of SFP 21, like the other pits with similar traits, probably was for food and root storage (see Figure 6.5). The absence of any additional pits in Structure 20 clearly deviates from the pattern in the other two Period 2 housing units. Samford has examined the evidence and concluded that Structure 20 served a specialized function as a kitchen and food preparation and storage area, not as a housing unit (2000:85). While this interpretation is certainly plausible, it is also

¹⁴ Note that the original size, shape, and depth of SFP 21 was altered by modern disturbances. Modern disturbances prevented archaeologists from determining this possibility.

possible, following Neiman's thesis (1997), that the residents living in Structure 20 had no need to create personal storage spaces for themselves beyond a functional root cellaring pit in front of the hearth because they were interrelated or allied together, or had established a cooperative relationship based on trust.

Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750

The enslaved residents occupying Utopia during Period 3 created 21 discrete sub-floor pits within two housing units (Table 7.3). Three of the pits were located in Structure 40 and 18 in Structure 50 (see Figure 5.21). Eight of the 18 pits in Structure 50 were positioned in front of the hearth, and two of the three pits in Structure 40 fronted the hearth (see Table 7.3).

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 40

The occupants of Structure 40 dug three sub-floor pits in their rather small 12' by 16' housing unit. Evidence suggests that a partition wall divided the structure into two small, equally sized rooms, with SFPs 42 and 43 located in the hall and Pit 41 located in the parlor (see Figure 6.7).¹⁴ The largest of the pits, SFP 42, was centered in front of the hearth, positioned approximately 2.0' from the edge of the fireplace. Pit 43 also appeared to be oriented to the hearth, slightly off to one side, but still in close enough proximity to draw upon the ambient heat radiating from the fireplace.¹⁵ Pit 41 was positioned up against the probable partition wall in the parlor (see Figure 6.7).

All three sub-floor pits were rectangular in shape. Pits 42 and 43 were similar in size and depth and contained nearly the same amount of cubic space, 34.88 cubic feet and

¹⁴ Note that the original size, shape, and depth of SFP 43 was altered by modern disturbances.

¹⁵ It is possible that Pits 42 and 43 formed one large 3.5' by 9.5' pit, the largest hearth-front pit identified at Utopia. Modern disturbances prevented archaeologists from determining this possibility.

Table 7.3. Sub-floor pits at the Utopia Quarter, Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750.

	Position	Phase	Shape	Dimensions & Depth (in feet)	Cubic Area	Total Artifacts	Artifacts Per Cubic Foot	Volume Ratio of Space
Structure 40								
SFP 41	Wall	1	Rect	1.7x3.5x0.4	2.38	44	18.5	.012
SFP 42	Hearth	1	Rect	3.6x5.7x1.7	34.88	2036	58.4	.182
SFP 43	Hearth	1	Rect	4.0x4.6x2.0	36.80	890	24.2	.192
Totals					74.06	2970	40.1	.386
Structure 50								
SFP 51	Hearth	1	Rect	3.25x3.0x2.0	19.50*	516	26.5	.051
SFP 39B	Corner	1	Rect	4.0x4.0x1.6	25.60	471	18.4	.067
SFP 49	Corner	1	Rnd	3.5x3.5x0.8	7.69*	39	5.1	.020
SFP 56	Hearth	1-3	Rect	3.5x3.5x0.5	6.13*	15	2.4	.016
SFP 47	Middle	1-5	Rect	1.6x2.0x0.2	0.64	11	17.2	.002
SFP 46	Wall	1-5	Rnd	2.5x1.8x0.45	2.03	16	7.9	.005
SFP 44	Corner	1-5	Rect	2.9x3.8x1.1	12.12	222	18.3	.032
SFP 52	Hearth	2	Rect	3.0x3.2x1.3	12.48*	204	16.3	.033
SFP 39A	Corner	2-5	Rect	4.0x3.7x1.0	14.80	356	24.1	.039
SFP 48	Hearth	2-5	Rect	2.8x3.2x1.0	8.96	434	48.4	.023
SFP 53	Hearth	3	Rect	6.0x2.7x2.75	44.55*	1840	41.3	.116
SFP 55	Hearth	4	Rect	4.6x2.25x1.6	16.56*	796	48.1	.043
SFP 57	Hearth	4	Rect	5.0x2.65x2.8	37.10	1610	43.4	.097
SFP58C/E	Hearth	4	Rect	3.75x3.5x1.3	17.06*	861	50.5	.044
SFP 45	Corner	1-5	Rnd	4.6x4.25x2.65	40.67	1031	25.4	.106
SFP 58B	Hearth#	5	Rect	3.5x1.1x0.5	1.93	60	31.1	.005
SFP 58D	Hearth#	5	Rect	3.5x1.3x0.5	2.28	62	27.2	.006
SFP 54	Hearth#	5	Rnd	3.3x3.3x0.2	1.71	73	42.7	.004
Totals					271.81	8617	31.7	.708

* Cubic area is projected and does not represent the total amount of fill excavated.

Located in the hearth-front complex, but probably functioned as a personal storage pit, not for food or root preservation.

36.80 cubic feet, respectively (see Table 7.3). The dimensions of SFP 41 were much smaller and its depth extended only 0.4'. SFP 42 produced twice as many artifacts per cubic foot as Pit 43 or Pit 41 (see Table 7.3). For Structure 40 overall, by volume, 38.6 percent of the building's floor space was devoted to cubic sub-floor pit space, almost all of it for hearth-front storage.

Because of disturbances, the sequence of sub-floor pits in Structure 40 cannot be determined with any certainty. It is likely that all three pits were open at the same time. Centered on the fireplace, and nearly 2.0' in depth, Pits 42 and 43 almost certainly functioned as food storage cellars or root cellars. Pit 41's location in the parlor, and its reduced size and shallow depth indicate that it was intended for a more personal storage function. The presence of only one pit potentially for personal use and the two large root/food storage cellars in front of the fireplace presumably for communal use, the SFP profile for Structure 40 has every appearance of a small, interrelated family group or a group cooperating on a level that made the need for personal storage space almost negligible.

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 50

The construction of Structure 50 occurred in two episodes. The building began as a 12' by 16' core and later was expanded to twice that size. The floor space inside Structure 50 contained 18 sub-floor pits, 11 of them either fronting a gable-end hearth or within roughly 5' or less of it (see Table 7.3), and seven others positioned in the sheds and around the inner perimeter of the housing unit (see Figure 6.8).

Samford considers the hearth-front complex of sub-floor pits in the central hall of Structure 50 the most complicated sequencing of pits yet documented at a Chesapeake

slave quarter site (2000:94). Except for circular shaped SFP 54, all the hearth-front pits were rectangular (see Figure 6.8). In order of depth, the deepest pits within the hearth-front complex were SFP 57 ($n=2.8'$), Pit 53 ($n=2.75'$), and Pit 51 ($n=2.0'$). A second grouping of four pits (SFPs 55, 58C/E, 52, and 48) were between 1.0' and 1.6' in depth. A third group of four pits (SFP 56, 58B, 58D, and 54) were fairly shallow, ranging between 0.2' and 0.5' deep. In all cases depth correlated with volume among the hearth-front pits. For example, SFP 57 was the deepest of them and contained the largest cubic storage volume ($n=44.55$ cubic feet). SFP 54 was the shallowest and provided only 1.71 cubic feet of space, the least of the group (see Table 7.3).

If the main criteria for determining a root storage function for a sub-floor pit are its depth, size, and proximity to a heat source, some of the 11 pits situated within Structure 50's hearth-front complex may not have served as root cellars. The three shallowest pits in the complex, SFPs 58B, 58D, and 54, all held less than 2.5 cubic feet, too small to adequately store root crops, and they were placed at a great enough distance from the hearth that the heat from it was negligible (see Figure 6.8). These three pits probably were not intended, at least exclusively, for food or root storage, but were created for more personal storage needs (see Table 7.3).

By grouping SFPs 58B, 58D, and 54 with non-hearth-front pits, the eight remaining hearth-front pits supplied 162.34 cubic feet of subterranean space, which amounted to 60 percent of the total volume of cubic space available in all 18 sub-floor pits in Structure 50. The volume of artifacts from the hearth-front pits ranged from more than 50 per cubic foot in SFP 58C/E, to barely two artifacts per cubic foot in Pit 56 (see Figure 7.7). A determination cannot be made about exactly which pits were open

Table 7.3). Overall, the eight hearth-front pits yielded an average of 38.7 artifacts per cubic foot.

Seven of the sub-floor pits in Structure 50 were considered non-hearth-front pits. Six of these pits were positioned in the two shed additions on each side of the central hall and one corner pit was located in the hall at the opposite end of room from the hearth (see Figure 6.8). The west shed contained SFPs 39B, 39A, 47, and 46, and the east shed enclosed SFPs 49 and 44. Three of the seven non-hearth-front pits were round, and the remaining four were rectangular. The sizes and volumes of the seven non-hearth-front pits ranged widely from SFP 45 at 40.67 cubic feet (2.65' deep), to Pit 47 at 0.67 cubic feet (0.2' deep) (see Table 7.3). SFP 45 also yielded the most artifacts of this group of pits at a rate of more than 25 per cubic foot.

Compared to the eight hearth-front pits with a likely root storage function, the volume of artifacts from the remaining ten pits (including the three shallow hearth-front pits) averaged 21.8 per cubic foot, nearly half the volume of artifacts from the hearth pits. The ten SFPs judged to be used for non-root cellar storage supplied 40 percent of the storage volume for Structure 50. Overall, 70.8 percent of Structure 50's floor space, by volume, was used for SFP storage, an 83 percent increase in the use of sub-floor space compared to nearby Structure 40 (see Table 7.3).

Although the 18 pits inside Structure 50 appear to be a confused hodge-podge of random pitting episodes (see Figure 6.8), by sorting out the pits into a semblance of phases, an evolving storage strategy emerges. Based on the stratigraphic sequence of pits cutting into each other at least five pitting phases can be identified in front of the hearth (Figure 7.7). A determination cannot be made about exactly which pits were open

contemporaneously. For example, unintruded pits such as SFP 44 could have been open during one or all of the five phases, although it appears that Pits 46, 47, and 49 were filled early in the sequence (see Table 7.3). It is possible that at any one time as many as nine pits were open, or as few as two. Based on the sequencing of the hearth-front pits, the residents of Structure 50 usually maintained at least two root/food storage pits at all times. In the final phase, however, root or food storage had become less of a priority and possibly none of the pits were used for that purpose (see Figure 7.7).

Overall Structure 50 fits the sub-floor pit profile of a housing unit primarily inhabited as a barracks or for lodging individuals who were not initially compelled to share storage spaces, although some amount of cooperation may have been in effect for the root/food storage pits. The five phases of sub-floor pits in Structure 50 illustrate several patterns and trends. For one, the durability of hearth-front pits was poor. Because the hearth was the focal point of most indoor activity, pits in that area were placed under severe physical stress. None of the hearth-front pits in Structure 50 seems to have lasted very long, and residents spent time and energy to regularly replace them. Evidently, except perhaps for the final phase of pitting, the occupants felt it was necessary and worth the effort to have at least two pits for specialized root or food storage. The absence of pits for root/food storage in the final phase of use may indicate a change in the group of people living in Structure 50. The residents could have been transitioning to new quarters nearby, reducing the need for root/food storage in the unit. Moreover, more than 40 percent of the floor space in the housing unit, and virtually every square foot in front of the hearth, consisted of fill soil, making the ground around the

other Utopia housing units. In general the deeper pits provided the most cubic storage

hearth so unstable from repeated pitting that the area probably could no longer support any additional pits unless they were heavily reinforced.

Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775

The enslaved Africans living at Utopia during the fourth occupation period were sheltered in three structures, the largest divided into a duplex that functioned as two independent housing units (see Figure 5.32). While the structures themselves hardly left any identifiable archaeological traces of their existence, the residents dug 24 sub-floor pits during their tenure at the site (Table 7.4), and from them some of the architectural details could be extrapolated. Duplex 1 in the west half of Structure 140 contained ten pits, and Duplex 2 in the east half a dozen. Structures 150 and 160 each had a single pit in front of a hearth. The majority of the SFPs ($n=13$) formed two complexes fronting hearths in each duplex. An additional nine pits were situated throughout the remaining floor space of Duplex 1 and 2, usually along a wall or in a corner (see Table 7.4).

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 140, Duplex 1

Duplex 1 in the west half of Structure 140 was approximately 17' by 22' and contained ten pits, six of them hearth-front, and four unrelated by function to the hearth. All ten of the sub-floor pits in Duplex 1 were rectangular (see Table 7.4). On average the six hearth-front pits were several inches deeper than the four non-hearth-front pits. Depths for all pits spanned between a minimum of 1.0' (Pits 11D/E, 41A, and 29) and a maximum of 2.3' for Pit 12D/L-N (see Table 7.4). There was a relatively small disparity between the shallowest and the deepest pits in Duplex 1, a spread of 1.3', meaning volume did not perfectly correlate with depth as it did for some of the pit assemblages in other Utopia housing units. In general the deeper pits provided the most cubic storage

Table 7.4. Sub-floor pits at the Utopia Quarter, Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775.

	Position	Phase	Shape	Dimensions & Depth (in feet)	Cubic Area	Total Artifacts	Artifacts Per Cubic Foot	Volume Ratio of Space
Structure 140, Duplex 1								
SFP 11D/E	Hearth	1	Rect	2.3x4.0x1.0	9.20*	91	9.9	.025
SFP 41A	Hearth	1	Rect	3.5x5.3x1.0	18.55*	306	16.5	.050
SFP 12A/W ^b	Hearth	1-2	Rect	4.5x4.5x1.9	38.48	1073	27.9	.103
SFP 11/12 ^c	Hearth	2	Rect	4.4x5.4x1.9	45.14	1808	40.1	.121
SFP 40	Hearth	2	Rect	3.2x3.5x1.5	16.80*	405	24.1	.045
SFP12D/L-N ^a	Hearth	3	Rect	2.5x2.3x2.3	13.23	728	55.0	.035
SFP 9	Wall	1-3	Rect	4.6x2.5x1.6	18.40	369	20.1	.049
SFP 10	Wall	1-3	Rect	4.5x3.1x1.1	15.35	512	33.4	.041
SFP 13	Corner	1-3	Rect	4.8x5.0x1.5	36.00	513	14.3	.096
SFP 29	Corner	1-3	Rect	2.4x3.9x1.0	9.36	199	21.3	.025
Totals					220.5	6004	27.2	.590
Structure 140, Duplex 2								
SFP6B/G/H	Hearth	1	Rect	5.2x7.0x1.7	61.88*	235	3.8	.188
SFP 6R	Middle	1	Rect	1.5x2.75x0.9	3.71*	19	5.1	.011
SFP 36	Corner	1	Rect	3.1x2.0x1.6	9.92*	109	11.0	.030
SFP6C-F, J/K	Hearth	2	Rect	3.2x3.2x2.0	20.48*	451	22.0	.062
SFP6 L/M/N	Hearth	2	Rect	2.6x3.7x1.5	14.43*	394	27.3	.044
SFP 30E/F	Hearth	2	Rect	3.8x4.2x2.2	35.11*	528	15.0	.106
SFP 7	Corner	2-4	Rect	2.9x3.9x1.7	19.23	203	10.6	.058
SFP30A-D	Hearth	3	Rect	3.1x6.4x1.6	31.74	1235	38.9	.096
SFP 31	Hearth	3	Rect	2.1x3.9x1.9	15.56	439	28.2	.047
SFP 6P/Q	Hearth	4	Rect	3.2x3.9x2.2	27.46	122	4.4	.083
SFP 8	Wall	1-4	Rect	3.75x2.4x0.65	5.85	211	36.1	.018
SFP 5	Wall	1-4	Rect	4.3x4.5x3.9	75.47	599	7.9	.229
Totals					320.8	4545	14.2	.972

	Position	Phase	Shape	Dimensions & Depth (in feet)	Cubic Area	Total Artifacts	Artifacts Per Cubic Foot	Volume Ratio of Space
Structure 150								
SFP 4	Hearth	1	Rect	4.0x4.5x1.8	32.40	164	5.1	#
Totals					32.40	164	5.1	#
Structure 160								
SFP 19	Hearth	1	Rect	4.5x3.1x1.2	16.74	434	25.9	#
Totals					16.74	434	25.9	#

^a12D/L-N contains contexts: 12D, L, M, N

^b12A/W contains contexts: 12A, B, V, W, P, Q, S, T, U

^c11/12 contains contexts: 11B, C, F, H, J, 12C, E, F, G, H, J, K

dimensions of Structures 150 and 160 are unknown

* Cubic area is projected and does not represent the total amount of fill excavated

space, however the deepest pit in Duplex 1 (Pit 12D/L-N) was almost a perfect 2.3' cube, a rather unusual size and shape, and had one of the smaller storage capacities at 13.23 cubic feet, ranking eighth out of ten (see Table 7.4). The two largest pits by volume were SFPs 11/12 (45.14 cubic feet) and 12A/W (38.48 cubic feet), both hearth-front pits.

As a group the six hearth-front pits, presumably used for root/food storage, provided nearly two-thirds of the total sub-floor space (n=64 percent) in Duplex 1, while the four non-hearth-front pits used for other storage needs supplied the remaining one-third of the available space (n=36 percent). Overall, the ratio of pit space to floor space for Duplex 1 was 59 percent (see Table 7.4). The volume of artifacts from all ten SFPs ranged from 55 artifacts per cubic foot in SFP 12D/L-N, to 9.9 artifacts per cubic foot in Pit 11D/E, both hearth-front pits (see Table 7.4). The six hearth-front pits yielded an average of 31.2 artifacts per cubic foot, whereas the four pits not fronting the hearth

averaged slightly more than 20 artifacts per cubic foot, roughly one-third less than the hearth-front pits.

Although largely speculative, it appears as if three general phases of SFP usage occurred in Duplex 1 (Figure 7.8). The evidence suggests that at any one time no more than three, and most likely one or two, hearth-front pits were open and active (Figure 7.8). This is based on the sequence of pits cutting through one another, and on the premise that the walls of immediately adjacent pits (such as SFP 12A-W and 41A in the first phase) would not be able to coexist (see Figure 7.8). The sequencing of the four pits arrayed around the perimeter of the housing unit can not be determined, although based on the artifact densities, Pit 13 may have been early, and Pit 10 later in the sequence.

The apparent phases of sub-floor pit use in Duplex 1 demonstrate several significant patterns. Like Structure 50, the residents of Duplex 1 regularly replaced hearth-front pits until a 10' by 10' area consisted entirely of open pits cutting into fill soil, an indication that the occupants considered hearth-front pits essential. Based on the phasing, it would appear that the occupants of Duplex 1 maintained at all times at least one and sometimes two root/food storage pits intended primarily for specialized storage. It is likely, albeit unproven, that the residents maintained only one, perhaps two, non-hearth-front pits at a time for more personal storage needs. If this supposition is correct, what might appear from the many pits as a large group of individuals competing for limited floor space and cramming pits under the floor (see Figure 6.10), instead probably represents a well planned and executed system of sub-floor storage for a smaller household of people cooperating and sharing space over the span of several decades.

This interpretation is supported by comparing the forms of the hearth-front and non-hearth front pits in Duplex 1. Samford proposes, with good reason, that hearth-front pits served a "communal" use, for example, harvested potatoes that fed an entire household over the winter, whereas other types of pits located elsewhere in the housing unit functioned as more personal storage units (Samford 2000:267). Yet, in size, shape, and depth hearth and non-hearth pits were quite similar. In fact, the average cubic volume of hearth-front pits ($n=23.57$ cubic feet) differed from that of non-hearth-front pits ($n=19.78$ cubic feet) by less than 4 cubic feet. While size directly related to the function of root/food storage pits, other pits intended for personal use could be relatively small, only big enough and deep enough to store one's belongings. The relatively large size of the non-hearth-front pits in Duplex 1, therefore, can be interpreted as accommodating the personal storage needs of a group of people sharing one central pit and placing the collective household goods inside. Thus, for Duplex 1, the four pits located outside the immediate environs of the hearth, like hearth-front pits, seem to have served a community or group function as well.

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 140, Duplex 2

Duplex 2 in the east half of Structure 140 was approximately 15' by 22' and contained 12 sub-floor pits, seven fronting the hearth, and five located around the perimeter of the room (see Figure 6.10). All 12 of the SFPs in Duplex 2 were classified as rectangular (see Table 7.4). Although on average the seven hearth-front pits were only an inch or two deeper than the five non-hearth-front pits, exceedingly deep ($n=3.9'$) non-

¹⁶ Pit 5 probably was intended for cold food storage. If so, technically it could be considered similar in function to the root/food storage functions of hearth-front pits.

¹⁷ Without Pit 5 the non-hearth pits averaged roughly 10 cubic feet (see Table 7.3).

hearth-front Pit 5 skewed the average.¹⁶ Not counting Pit 5, the non-hearth pits were more than a half a foot shallower than the hearth pits (see Table 7.4). Even with Pit 5 in the mix, hearth-front pits in Duplex 2 averaged nearly 30 cubic feet, and non-hearth pits close to 23 cubic feet.¹⁷ While non-hearth-front SFP 5 was the largest pit by volume (75.47 cubic feet) in Duplex 2, seven of the next eight pits by order of volume were hearth-front pits. Hearth-front pits proved generally to be larger and deeper than non-hearth front pits in Duplex 2.

The residents in Duplex 2 used 100 cubic feet more for sub-floor storage (n=320.84 cubic feet total) compared to Duplex 1 (n=220.51 cubic feet total), yet hearth-front pits provided 64 percent of the total space in Duplex 2, exactly the same percentage as in Duplex 1. Because of the large size and volume of almost every one of the 12 sub-floor pits in Duplex 2, its ratio of pit space to floor space was at 97.2 percent (see Table 7.4). This was the largest volume ratio for sub-floor space for any of the housing units at Utopia. The volume of artifacts from the SFPs in Duplex 2 ranged from a high of 39 artifacts per cubic foot in SFP 30A-D, to a low of 2.8 artifacts per cubic foot in Pit 6B/G/H, both hearth-front pits (see Table 7.4). The seven hearth-front pits produced an average of 16.5 artifacts per cubic foot, while the five pits outside the hearth averaged ten artifacts per cubic foot, roughly 40 percent less than the hearth-front pits.

Four major pitting phases seem to have taken place in Duplex 2 (see Figure 7.8). Similar to Duplex 1, it would appear that between one and three hearth-front pits were in active use at any one time (see Figure 7.8). The sequencing of the non-hearth pits

¹⁶ Pit 5 probably was intended for cold food storage. If so, technically it could be considered similar in function to the root/food storage functions of hearth-front pits.

¹⁷ Without Pit 5 the non-hearth pits averaged roughly 10 cubic feet (see Table 7-5).

remains unknown, but based on artifact densities it is possible that Pit 8 was filled in last (see Table 7.4). The possible phasing of sub-floor pit use in Duplex 2 reiterates some of the same patterns found in Duplex 1 and Structure 50. The area fronting the hearth, what amounted to roughly one-third of the floor space in Duplex 2, was prime real estate and pitted repeatedly, offering evidence again that hearth-front pits served an essential role in the proper storage and maintenance of foodstuffs. Furthermore, while the sequence of SFPs is hardly definitive, it would appear that the occupants of Duplex 2 had no more than four pits open at one time, and more realistically only two or three. Given only four non-hearth-front pits, and four apparent phases of hearth-front pitting, it could be concluded that only one of these more "personal" storage pits was open at one time. If the veracity of this analysis is correct, the residents of the unit shared all their sub-floor storage spaces, both hearth-front and non-hearth-front pits.

Although the morphological characteristics of the hearth and non-hearth pits in Duplex 1 and Duplex 2 differed, and Duplex 2 provided 100 cubic feet of additional space compared to Duplex 1, it is rather extraordinary that the exact same percentage of space was devoted to hearth-front and non-hearth-front storage in both duplexes. This suggests that the populations that inhabited both units, by chance or design, employed virtually identical storage strategies, and must have consisted of similar groups, almost certainly families or intimately associated people.

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 150

Other than SFP 4, there was no other valid evidence of the presence and location of Structure 150. Based on Pit 4's orientation, and the scant remains of two possible pier supports, Structure 150 may have been approximately 15' by 17' in size and located

roughly 12' north of Structure 140 (see Figures 5.32 and 6.11). Within the dimensions of this speculative structure it is surmised Pit 4 was positioned in front of the hearth, probably a wattle and daub chimney on the west end of the building (see Figure 6.11). Almost square, the 4.0' by 4.5' sub-floor pit was 1.8' deep, which provided 32.4 cubic feet of storage space (see Table 7.4). Pit 4 yielded relatively few artifacts, given its size, at a rate of only 5.1 per cubic foot, an indication that the pit was filled with reasonably clean secondary refuse.

Given the depth of SFP 4 and its likely position in front of a hearth, it has the characteristics of a root/food storage pit. The absence of any additional pits in Structure 150 may signify that the inhabitants of the housing unit consisted of a family or interrelated group that had no motivation to seek out sub-floor space to protect or prohibit access to personal belongings. It may not be coincidental that Pit 4 contained a large lock plate fragment, suggesting that the door to Structure 150 could be locked by the inhabitants. If so, with the ability to secure the house, and Pit 4 functioning as a communal pit for the household's root and food storage needs, the energy and time spent digging additional SFPs could be devoted to other activities.

Sub-Floor Pits in Structure 160

Like Structure 150, Structure 160 was identified solely by the presence of a single sub-floor pit. SFP 19 was located approximately 20' to the north and east from Structure 150 (see Figures 5.32 and 6.11). Without the architectural evidence, the position of Pit 19 within Structure 160 is unknown. In fact, the size of Structure 160 is conjectured to be 12' by 16', although this nothing more than an educated guess. Given its 4.5' by 3.1' dimensions and its 1.2' depth, the 16.74 cubic feet of space provided by SFP 19 has the

functional traits of other hearth-front pits at Utopia. Moreover, its elongated rectangular shape suggests that it was placed lengthwise along the front edge of the hearth to maximize the heat from a fireplace (see Figure 6.11). Archaeologists recovered artifacts at a rate of 25.9 per cubic foot from Pit 19, a fairly high density, and there were enough intact artifacts located on or near the floor of the pit to suggest that some of the contents were primary refuse (Figure 7.9).

Although the evidence is limited, the characteristics of SFP 19 indicate it was a hearth-front pit used for root/food storage. The lack of any further pitting in Structure 160, like nearby Structure 150, implies that the residents of the house were well acquainted with each other and had no need to dig additional sub-floor storage spaces. Although no lock parts or keys were found in Pit 19, archaeologists recovered 23 lock parts from Period 4, more than the other three occupation periods combined, suggesting that locking one's belongings in a box, chest, or the house was a common occurrence. With the apparent availability of door locks or padlocks for the residents of Structure 160, and the likelihood that most of the members of the household could be trusted, all that was needed was a single pit for root/food storage.

Findings Concerning Sub-Floor Pits at Utopia

A comparison of the sub-floor pitting profiles of the nine housing units at Utopia reveals that the basic forms and functions of SFPs remained constant, but storage strategies differed between structures and largely depended on the composition of the group living in the housing unit. By deconstructing the pitting pattern for each unit at Utopia, and taking into account the possible phases of digging and filling, a concerted pitting strategy emerges.

Perhaps the most prominent factor concerning sub-floor pits at Utopia is the difference in form and function between hearth-front and non-hearth-front pits. Hearth-front pits adhered to a regular, almost rigid, form regarding shape and depth, whereas non-hearth-front pits varied considerably in both shape and depth (Table 7.5). Of the 33 hearth-front pits, all were rectangular or square in shape, indicating that the function of hearth-front pits was closely related to the form they took. Among the 31 pits positioned outside the hearth at least 26 percent ($n=8$) were round, inferring that the function of those pits was not necessarily contingent upon their shapes, but was a matter of personal preference (see Table 7.5). Moreover, in each of the nine housing units and for the three occupation periods, hearth-front pits consistently were deeper than non-hearth-front pits by at least several inches. Overall, hearth-front pits were more than half a foot deeper than their non-hearth positioned counterparts (see Table 7.5). This again reinforces the strong probability that the function of hearth-front pits for food and root storage depended upon finding a proper balance between the position of a pit vis-à-vis a heat source as a temperature and humidity control, its depth as a temperature control, and its shape to maximize its cubic volume of space.

Samford has characterized hearth-front pits as "communal" pits used by all members of a coresidential group or household, and non-hearth-front pits as more personal pits for other storage purposes, perhaps even a few religious shrines (Samford 2000:267). At minimum, seven housing units at Utopia contained at least one hearth-front pit, and single pits in Structures 150 and 160 likely fronted hearths as well, meaning every unit at Utopia had one or more pits for this purpose. Evidently, root/food storage was of primary importance to every household and coresidential group at Utopia, above

Table 7.5. Utopia sub-floor pits grouped by elements of form.

Structure	Total SFPs	Hearth-Front			Non-Hearth Front		
		Number	Rectangular-Square/Round	Mean Depth (in feet)	Number	Rectangular-Square/Round	Mean Depth (in feet)
Period 2, 1700 – ca. 1730							
Str. 1	6	4	4/0	1.10	2	1/1	0.75
Str. 10	12	3	3/0	1.62	9	6/3	0.62
Str. 20	1	1	1/0	1.25	0		
Period 2	19	8	8/0	1.31	11	7/4	0.64
Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750							
Str. 40	3	2	2/0	1.85	1	1/0	0.40
Str. 50	18	8	8/0	1.53	10	6/4	0.90
Period 3	21	10	10/0	1.60	11	7/4	0.85
Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775							
Str. 140-1	10	6	6/0	1.60	4	4/0	1.30
Str. 140-2	12	7	7/0	1.87	5	5/0	1.75
Str. 150	1	1	1/0	1.8	0		
Str. 160	1	1	1/0	1.2	0		
Period 4	24	15	15/0	1.71	9	9/0	1.55
Totals	64	33	33/0	1.58	31	23/8	0.98

and beyond any other storage needs. The fact that in Structures 1, 10, 50, Duplex 1, and Duplex 2 the residents dug a series of root/food storage pits, eventually creating unstable complexes of refilled, intersecting holes illustrates that successful root and food storage required close positioning to a heat source, otherwise the pits would have been distributed to other more stable areas of the house, they would have lasted longer, and they would have required less maintenance.

Table Comparisons of the sub-floor pit patterns among the nine Utopia housing units

illustrates that two of the units—Structures 10 and 50—exhibited pit characteristics that differed significantly from the other seven units (Table 7.6). Both housing units contained more non-hearth-front pits than hearth-front ones, the only two housing units at Utopia to have such a majority (see Table 7.1). In Structure 10 fully 75 percent of its pits were located outside the hearth ($n=9$), most likely for personal storage. These nine non-hearth-front pits provided 52 percent of the total storage capacity in Structure 10, the only housing unit at Utopia that saw non-hearth-front pits exceed hearth-front pits in cubic space (see Table 7.6). The ten non-hearth-front pits in Structure 50 outnumbered the hearth-front pits ($n=8$) slightly and supplied 40 percent of the cubic space for the housing unit, the second highest percentage at Utopia for non-hearth-front pits (see Table 7.6). Given the amount of non-hearth-front pits in Structures 10 and 50, the sizes of both buildings, and the patterning of pits in them, these two housing units appear to have served primarily as barracks for group lodging.

The other seven housing units at Utopia have a different configuration of SFPs with hearth-front pits outnumbering non-hearth-front ones at a ratio of nearly 2:1. For these housing units for which a semblance of pitting phases can be determined, there appears to have been a minimal number of non-hearth-front pit open at any one time, suggesting a communal use for them. In total, seven housing units at Utopia have pitting patterns that strongly indicate that the occupants were members of a household functioning cooperatively and sharing pits, whereas Structures 10 and 50 chiefly functioned as lodging for coresidential groups comprised of individuals not willing or able to fully cooperate and share storage spaces.

Table 7.6. Sub-floor pit profiles for housing units at the Utopia Quarter.

Structure	Total SFPs	Hearth-Front SFPs	Cubic Area for Hearth-Front SFPs	% of Cubic Area	Non-Hearth-Front SFPs	Cubic Area for Non-Hearth-Front SFPs	% of Cubic Area	Total Cubic SFP	Volume Ratio of Space
Period 2, ca. 1700 – ca. 1730									
Str. 1	6	4	56.64	76%	2	17.71	24%	74.35	.221
Str. 10	12	3	59.42	48%	9	63.79	52%	123.21	.218
Str. 20	1	1	33.75	100%	0	0	0	33.75	.100
Period 2	19	8	149.81	65%	11	81.5	35%	231.31	.187
Period 3, ca. 1730 – ca. 1750									
Str. 40	3	2	71.68	97%	1	2.38	3%	74.06	.386
Str. 50	18	8	162.34	60%	10	109.47	40%	271.81	.708
Period 3	21	10	234.02	68%	11	111.85	32%	345.87	.600
Period 4, ca. 1750 – ca. 1775									
Str. 140-1	10	6	141.40	64%	4	79.11	36%	220.51	.590
Str. 140-2	12	7	206.66	64%	5	114.18	36%	320.84	.972
Str. 150	1	1	32.40	100%	0	0	0	32.40	.127#
Str. 160	1	1	16.74	100%	0	0	0	16.74	.087#
Period 4	24	15	397.20	67%	9	193.29	33%	590.49	.513
Totals	64	33	781.03	67%	31	386.64	33%	1167.7	.394

Actual dimensions of Structures 150 and 160 are unknown, figures based on estimates.

Structures 10 and 50 clearly produced a pitting pattern that differed significantly from Utopia's seven other quartering units. Structure 10 was occupied during Period 2 (ca. 1700 – ca. 1730), and Structure 50 a generation later in Period 3 (ca. 1730 – ca. 1750), evidence that social stability at Utopia still was in flux during both periods. James Bray II continued to introduce new slaves to Utopia during Period 2, people who the existing residents initially considered to be strangers or outsiders, and his son and grandson did the same in Period 3. By Period 4 (ca. 1750 – ca. 1775) the inflow of

newcomers appears to have slowed or ceased, and according to the pitting patterns none of the four housing units functioned as barracks, although Duplex 1 and 2 in Structure 140 were intensively occupied and subjected to a high volume of pits.

This transition from coresidential groups to households at Utopia, as the terms are defined in an earlier chapter, is reflected by a reduction in the number of sub-floor pits, particularly those located away from the hearth and not used for root or food storage. Presumably the need for private storage space declined as the occupants of individual quarters increasingly were able to cohabitate with family members, and all sub-floor space served communal needs. However, a comparison of SFPs among the three Utopia occupation periods (omitting Period 1), fails to demonstrate that pitting patterns changed in response to the evolving social groups that lived at the site. For example, for all three periods at Utopia the residents apportioned their sub-floor space almost identically, consistently devoting two-thirds of the space to hearth-front storage for root/food preservation, and one-third to other types of storage located away from the hearth (see Table 7.6). While the total amount of sub-floor space increased markedly between periods by more than 50 percent, from 231.31 cubic feet in Period 2, to 345.87 in Period 3, to 590.49 in Period 4, the percentage of space devoted to hearth-front storage and non-hearth-front storage was maintained.

As measured by the average number of sub-floor pits used in each of the last three Utopia occupation periods, there is no clear evidence of a consistent downward trend in pit use (Table 7.7). There is a tentative sign of change in the reduction of non-hearth-front pits—the ones supposedly most representative of social change—from Period 3 to Period 4, however this is not supported by an equally unmistakable drop in the average

Table 7.7. Sub-floor pit totals at Utopia, by period.

	All Nine Housing Units*	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4
Average # of Hearth SFPs per Housing Unit	3.7	2.7	5.0	3.8
Average # of Non-Hearth SFPs per Housing Unit	3.4	3.7	5.5	2.3
Average # of Total SFPs per Housing Unit	7.1	6.3	10.5	6.0
Average Cubic Space for Hearth SFPs per Unit	86.8	49.9	117.0	99.3
Average Cubic Space for Non-Hearth SFPs per Unit	43.0	27.2	55.9	48.3
Average Cubic Space Total for SFPs per Housing Unit	129.7	77.1	173.0	147.6
Volume Ratio of Hearth SFPs per Housing Unit	26.4%	12.1%	40.6%	34.5%
Volume Ratio of Non-Hearth SFP Space per Housing Unit	13.1%	6.6%	19.4%	16.8%
Volume Ratio of SFP Space per Housing Unit	39.4%	18.7%	60.0%	51.3%

* Does not include Period 1 housing units.

amount of pit space or in the ratio of pit space to floor space between the two occupation periods (see Table 7.7). It would appear that the nature of pit use, the varying functions of them, coupled with the regular maintenance and re-digging of many of them introduces too many variables to conclusively demonstrate the relationship of SFPs with the ever-changing social landscape at Utopia. However, at a more refined house-by-house scale, pitting patterns in Structures 10 and 50 confirm that the occupying groups of these two buildings evidently differed from the other seven housing units. It is significant that Structures 10 and 50 were occupied as coresidential units in the first half of the 18th century at Utopia when many Chesapeake slaves were still in the process of establishing social ties and relationships that eventually would provide a new level of

stability for later generations. The strength of the relationships that the Utopia slaves were able to build may be reflected in the pitting patterns of the final occupation period when all four housing units exhibit signs of fully integrated, cooperative households working together and sharing storage spaces, although a strict reading of the numbers does not indicate this.

The Rise and Fall of the Sub-Floor Pit in the Chesapeake

Seven of nine housing units at Utopia appear to have been occupied by households, in most cases by simple or extended families, particularly in the latter occupation (Period 4). However, the statistical evidence of these living arrangements as measured by SFPs in the three periods does not clearly reflect these differences. To further explore and clarify the changes in pit usage the dataset of 73 Chesapeake slave quarters (Utopia included) introduced in the previous chapter will be dissected once again (see Appendix E and Figure 6.12). For the analysis of Utopia's sub-floor pits the level of information included details such as cubic space, volume, depth, shape, and interior position. However, for the majority of the 73 quarters in the dataset the only definitive data regarding SFPs was the total number of them located inside each housing unit.

The dataset contains 269 sub-floor pits among the 73 slave housing units, translating to an average of 3.68 SFPs per housing unit (Table 7.8). The median number of SFPs is 2.0 per housing unit. The standard deviation is 4.61 and the variance is 21.25. The range is 22 between the largest number of pits in a single housing unit (22 in Kingsmill Quarter Structure 1) and 12 housing units which contain no pits (see Table 7.8 and Appendix E).

Table 7.8. Descriptive statistics for sub-floor pits per housing unit.

Housing Units	Total SFPs	$\bar{x}$	Median	Standard Deviation	Variance	Min	Max
73	269	3.68	2	4.61	21.25	0	22

A box-and-dot plot of the dataset illustrates that the distribution of the data values is skewed upward (Figure 7.10). Five of the cases—Carter's Grove House B (n=13), Governor's Land Structure 104 (n=14), Richneck Quarter (n=15), Utopia Structure 50 (n=18), Kingsmill Quarter Structure 1 (n=22)—are extreme outliers, and there are six additional outlier cases. To correct for the upward skewing, a square root transformation was applied to the dataset (Figure 7.11), producing a more symmetrical distribution, although it is still top-heavy with five outliers, those that were extreme outliers for the untransformed dataset (cf. Figures 7.11 and 7.12).

The 73 cases were placed into the same nine temporal Period subgroupings used to test housing unit size (see Table 6.4). By tracking the means in the Period A grouping it appears that over time SFP totals form a bell curve, beginning at or below three SFPs per building in the early 18th century, peaking in the 1760 to 1780 period, and quickly declining by 1800 (Table 7.9; Figure 7.12).¹⁸ The dataset with a trimmed mean is a more uniform bell curve, and the median also tracks a bell curve as well (see Figure 7.12). From this, it would appear that the average number of SFPs in Chesapeake slave quarters gradually rose throughout the 18th century until the American Revolution and then steadily diminished until virtually disappearing on the eve of the Civil War.

¹⁸ The initial peak at an average of six sub-floor pits per housing unit in the 1680 to 1700 subperiod is due to an outlier, the 14 pits in the Governor's Land Structure 104. Without it, the mean falls to two SFPs per housing unit for the subperiod.

Table 7.9. Summary of sub-floor pit counts per housing unit for Period A.

Code #	Period A	Number of SFPs All Cases			
		N	$\bar{x}$	Md.	St. Dev.
1	1660-1680	0	0	0	0
2	1680-1700	3	6.00	3	7
3	1700-1720	9	3.33↓	2↓	3.7
4	1720-1760	18	5.11↑	4↑	4.8
5	1760-1780	13	6.23↑	5↑	6.1
6	1780-1800	17	2.41↓	1↓	3.4
7	1800-1830	7	0.86↓	1-	1.1
8	1830-1860	6	0.17↓	0↓	0.4
		73	3.68	2	4.6

To further investigate this apparent rise and fall of the sub-floor pit, eight housing unit among the three subperiods was significant (see Table 7.11). Test E ANOVA tests were performed on the square root transformed dataset. A Null Hypothesis for each of the ANOVA tests stated that the number of SFPs per housing unit was equal. The Null Hypothesis for all eight tests was rejected, meaning that the number of SFPs per housing unit was not equal and the difference between the number of SFPs per housing unit over time was significant at the 95 percent confidence level ($\alpha = .05$).

Tests B, C, and D were performed on two groups of cases divided on either side of a midpoint at 1760 (Test B), 1780 (Test C), and 1800 (Test D) (Table 7.10). For each of the three tests the number of sub-floor pits per housing unit decreased and the difference observed in SFPs per housing unit was significant (see Table 7.10). However, Test B proved to be the weakest test of the three; the difference between the means on either side of 1760 was not as striking as the difference between them when divided by 1780 or by 1800. These findings suggest that sub-floor pit usage was on the decline by

1760, but this trend accelerated by 1780, and continued into the 19th century when sub-floor pits became the exception rather than the norm.

Table 7.10. ANOVA tests for sub-floor pits in Periods B, C, and D.

1. Test B (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	2. Test C (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	3. Test D (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$
1. 1660-1760 (30)	1.933	1. 1660-1780 (43)	2.024	1. 1660-1800 (60)	1.806
2. 1760-1860 (43)	1.304	2. 1780-1860 (30)	0.902	2. 1800-1860 (13)	0.441
F = 5.930	p = .017	F = 23.076	p = .000	F = 19.943	p = .000

Tests E, F, and G were conducted on cases divided into three temporal subperiods (Table 7.11). All three tests indicated that the difference between sub-floor pits per housing unit among the three subperiods was significant (see Table 7.11). Test E demonstrated a slight rise in SFPs from the 1660–1720 subperiod to the 1720–1780 subperiod, before a noticeable drop in SFPs in the 1780–1860 subperiod. A Scheffe's pairwise multiple comparison test identified significant variability between subperiods #2 and #3. Test F showed a small decrease in SFPs between the 1660–1760 subperiod to the 1760–1800 subperiod, before a precipitous decline in SFPs in the 1800–1860 subperiod. The Scheffe's test for Test F cited a significant difference between subperiods #1 and #3, and #2 and #3. The subperiods for Test G were similar to Test F, only divided by 1780 between subperiods #1 and #2 instead of 1760, and illustrated a continual decrease in SFPs (see Table 7.11). The Scheffe's test for Test G indicated significant differences between subperiods #1 and #2, and #1 and #3. The two most important trend to be drawn from these three ANOVA tests is that SFPs enjoyed an efflorescence between 1720 and

1780, followed by a sharp decline after 1780.

Table 7.11. ANOVA tests for sub-floor pits in Periods E, F, and G.

1. Test E (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	2. Test F (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	3. Test G (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$
1. 1660-1720 (12)	1.719	1. 1660-1760 (29)	1.931	1. 1660-1780 (43)	2.024
2. 1720-1780 (31)	2.142	2. 1760-1800 (31)	1.688	2. 1780-1800 (17)	1.254
3. 1780-1860 (30)	0.902	3. 1800-1860 (13)	0.441	3. 1800-1860 (13)	0.441
F = 12.445	p = .000	F = 10.390	p = .000	F = 14.921	p = .000

Two ANOVA tests were generated on cases divided into four temporal subperiods (Table 7.12). For both Test H and Test I the difference in sub-floor pits per housing unit between the four subperiods was significant (see Table 7.12). In Test H, due to outliers in subperiod #1, its mean was artificially elevated; however the means did diminish over the four subperiods (see Table 7.12). A Scheffe's test indicated significant variation between subperiods #2 and #4, and #3 and #4. Test I proved to be one of the most evocative ANOVA tests. It revealed a gradual increase in SFPs per housing unit up to 1780, and then an abrupt decline (see Table 7.12). According to a Scheffe's test, subperiods #2 and #3 significantly varied from subperiod #4. Both tests, again, reiterated the increased use of SFPs throughout the 18th century up to 1780, followed by a conspicuous lapse.

An interpretation of the ANOVA results suggests that sub-floor pit usage dropped significantly after 1780. Up to that point, SFP usage was on the rise, even between 1760 and 1780, the average number of SFPs rose, only to tumble dramatically in the last two

Table 7.12. ANOVA tests for sub-floor pits in Periods H and I.

1. Test H (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$	2. Test I (Cases)	$\sqrt{x}$
1. 1660-1700 (3)	2.158	1. 1660-1720 (12)	1.719
2. 1700-1760 (27)	1.908	2. 1720-1760 (18)	2.076
3. 1760-1800 (30)	1.678	3. 1760-1780 (13)	2.233
4. 1800-1860 (13)	0.441	4. 1780-1860 (30)	0.902
F = 6.943	p = .000	F = 8.265	p = .000

decades of the 18th century (see Figure 7.12). Before 1780 quarters with five, ten, or more SFPs were a common occurrence; after 1780 the average number of pits in any one housing unit shrank dramatically. And by the 19th century SFPs had almost vanished altogether.

Sub-Floor Pits and the Slave Family at Utopia and the Greater Chesapeake

The evidence both at Utopia and the larger Chesapeake suggests that sub-floor pits served two primary storage functions. Pits fronting hearths were for food or root storage, and pits located elsewhere within a housing unit served other purposes, primarily personal storage. Even someone like planter Landon Carter was aware, perhaps subconsciously, that there were differing uses for the pits. Carter's 1770 diary reference to "holes and boxes" within his slaves' quarters (see epigraph) infers that Carter differentiated between "holes" that were for individual use, whereas the term "boxes" suggests more permanent, formal pits—wood-lined and reinforced—and used as root

cellars or for food storage. Although vaguely cognizant of the functional differences of types of pits, Carter probably did not pause to consider the social ramifications of those holes and boxes and how important they were for the slaves under his control.

Of the six basic potential functions for sub-floor pits outlined earlier, there is strong evidence that at least three of those uses were employed at Utopia. The residents of Utopia used pits for food storage, including root cellaring and an isolated example of a probable cold storage "cooler," for personal storage, and for religious purposes as shrines (see Samford 2000:207-214). Based on the SFP "profiles" developed for each of the nine housing units with pits at Utopia, every structure had at least one hearth-front pit used for food storage of some kind. This suggests that the most important function of SFPs at Utopia was the storage and protection of food resources, including the seasonal activity of root cellaring. Six of the nine housing units had both hearth-front pits and additional pits located away from the hearth primarily for personal storage needs. Other functions for pits as religious shrines and for cold food storage were much more sporadic and relatively uncommon compared to their primary use for food or root storage and for personal goods.

Overall, the pitting profiles for the nine Utopia housing units indicate that seven of the buildings were occupied by groups of slaves who shared a small number of sub-floor pits. The use of SFP storage spaces in these seven buildings was communal in nature, and indicated that the residents of each were cooperating to the extent that the groups formed functioning households. However, two of the houses, Structure 10 in Period 2 and Structure 50 in Period 3, significantly differed from the norm. Based on their pitting profiles, Structures 10 and 50 were used for lodging groups of people who

were unwilling or unable to share some of the personal storage spaces.

The presence of a so-called barracks at Utopia during Period 2 (1700 – ca. 1730) and Period 3 (ca. 1730 – ca. 1750) is compatible with the documentary record for the site. Both James Bray II during Period 2 and Thomas and James Bray III during Period 3 regularly purchased African slaves and apparently housed the newcomers in a shelter intended for group lodging. In fact, the Brays expanded Structure 50 to twice its original size for the express purpose of converting it into a barracks (see Figure 6.8). Other creole slaves owned by the Brays, or those Africans who had sufficiently integrated themselves into the resident population, were able to reside with friends and relatives and were not compelled to dig individual sub-floor pits. By the final occupation period (ca. 1750 – ca. 1775), the flow of new Africans to Utopia had slowed to a trickle. The pitting profiles for Period 4 show no evidence of group lodging, only relatively small, intensively occupied, housing units clearly intended for smaller households of interrelated people. For example, sequencing suggests that no more than three SFPs were active within the Period 4 duplexes at any one time, a strong indication that pits were shared by all members of each household (see Figure 7.8).

At Utopia the sub-floor pit patterns suggest that some level of residential stability was achieved by the third quarter of the 18th century. Compared to the findings from the dataset of 73 Chesapeake slave quarters, the residents of Utopia enjoyed relative social stability earlier than the average Chesapeake slave. The statistical analyses applied to the sub-floor pits in the dataset all indicate a significant decrease in pit usage after 1780. In some cases SFPs were on the decline by 1760, but statistically significant change occurred in the 1780s. And certainly by 1800 there was a dramatic reduction in the

number of SFPs in Chesapeake slave quarters. By the early decades of the 19th century SFPs had become something of a rarity, perhaps even an oddity, used only infrequently by Chesapeake slaves. By 1830 the overwhelming majority of slave quarters did not possess any pits, an apparent indication that a generation of slaves had little or no firsthand knowledge of them.

The gradual rise of the Chesapeake sub-floor pit in the late 17th and into the 18th century and its near disappearance in the 19th century can be attributed to many factors. However, extensive pit usage at Utopia, and SFP trends observed at 73 Chesapeake slave quarters indicate that the rise and fall of SFPs occurred in conjunction with the emergence of the slave family. The residents of a typical Chesapeake slave quarter in 1720 or 1740 were more likely to function as a non-organized coresidential group and to produce a higher frequency of SFPs compared to 1780 or 1800 when the majority of slave quarters functioned as households comprised of interrelated kin cooperating and sharing pits, or not needing them at all. The circumstances at each plantation were unique. Barracks continued to be used in the 19th century on occasion, and slave families occupied comparatively stable households in the early 18th century on some plantations. At Utopia, for instance, no slaves were lodged in a barracks after 1750 and residential units were comprised exclusively of simple or extended family units in the final occupation episode (ca. 1750 – ca. 1775). For the Chesapeake as a whole the drop-off of pits occurred in the 1780s and 1790s, in conjunction with the American Revolution, and more importantly, with the efflorescence of the slave family. By 1800 with the steady growth of residential units populated by slave families, the usefulness of the sub-floor pit had run its course.

Figure 7.2. Excavation of Sub-Floor Pit 3, Period 4 Utopia, a possible cold storage pit.

Figure 7.1. *In situ* artifacts on the floor of Sub-Floor Pit 355 at Kingsmill Quarter.

Figure 7.2. Excavation of Sub-Floor Pit 5, Period 4 Utopia, a possible cold storage pit.

Figure 7.3. Sub-Floor Pit 36 during excavation, facing west.

Figure 7.4. Evidence of wood lining and *in-situ* strap hinge in Sub-Floor Pit 36.

- A = dark to medium brown sandy loam w/charcoal and brick inclusions
 B = dark brown ashy loam w/heavy charcoal inclusions
 C = gray and brown very ashy loam mixed with very heavy charcoal
 D = charred and fire-reddened medium brown loam
 E = medium brown sandy loam mixed w/ash, charcoal and tan loam
 F = orange and tan sand loam mottled with brown loam
 G = dark brown sand loam mottled w/white and yellow clay and charcoal
 H = medium brown sandy loam mottled w/yellow sand and orange clay
 I = light brown sand loam mottled w/orange and yellow clay
 J = medium brown sandy loam mottled w/charcoal and ash
 K = dark brown and gray sandy loam w/heavy charcoal
 L = light to medium brown loam w/orange and white clay mottles
 L1 = light to medium brown loam w/orange and white clay mottles
 L2 = light to medium brown loam w/orange and white clay mottles
 M = light brown sandy loam w/yellow sandy and orange clay mottles

Figure 7.5. Profile of Sub-Floor Pit 36 and Pit 37, facing west.

- A = gray/brown sandy loam, possible modern disturbance
 B = dark brown loam
 C and C/2 = dark gray/brown loam mixed with ashy charcoal
 D = yellow clay pocket mixed with crushed marl
 F = brown loam mottled with yellow sand
 G = gray loam mixed with pinkish clay, with charcoal layer at its base
 H = brown loam mixed with moderate amount of yellow marl
 J = similar to Layer H with heavier amount of yellow marl

Figure 7.6. Profile of Sub-Floor Pit 21, facing north.

Figure 7.7. Five phases of sub-floor pitting in Structure 50.

Figure 7.9. *Intus* artifacts on the floor of Sub-Floor Pit 19, possible primary refuse.

Figure 7.8. Phasing of sub-floor pitting in Structure 140, Duplex 1 and 2.

Figure 7.9. *In situ* artifacts on the floor of Sub-Floor Pit 19, possible primary refuse.

Figure 7.10. Box-and-dot plot of sub-floor pits in 73 Chesapeake slave housing units.

Figure 7.11. Box-and-dot plot for the square root transformed sub-floor pits in 73 Chesapeake slave housing units.

Figure 7.12. Chart of mean, trimmed mean, and median SFPs per housing unit.

CHAPTER VIII.

ARTIFACT ASSEMBLAGES AND THE SLAVE FAMILY

Culture is pattern in mind.

Henry Glassie (1975:17)

Thus far the examination of changing housing unit size and sub-floor pitting patterns indicate that the conditions for slave family development at Utopia and in the larger Chesapeake steadily improved over the course of the 18th century. While houses and sub-floor pits are significant forms of historical archaeological evidence, especially in terms of determining residency patterns and change, the recovery of artifacts remains the focal point of archaeological excavation. Over the course of excavating the Utopia Quarter archaeologists recovered 93,664 artifacts.¹

My objective in this chapter is to investigate the transition from coresident groups to households over time at Utopia by comparing assemblages of artifacts from the ten housing units. The archaeological dilemma is to figure out how to differentiate between coresident groups and households. I must identify artifact types that changed or were used differently by coresident groups and households and thereby produced disparate quantities and ratios in the archaeological record. Two socio-cultural phenomena have been chosen as proxies to measure or explain the potential differences between the two residency groups: resource consumption and gender. The premise behind resource consumption analysis is that households were more efficient, organized, and better equipped than coresident groups to acquire certain types of resources. Those housing

¹ In addition to 895.7 lbs. of charcoal, oyster shell, egg shell, mortar, daub, and brick that was weighed instead of individually counted. These figures only account for the items recovered during excavations in the 1990s. An unknown number of artifacts, at minimum several thousand, were collected during the initial excavation of the site in the 1970s (see Kelso 1976, 1984).

units that indicate relatively elevated levels of consumer goods during analysis are likely to have functioned as households. Furthermore, a concentration of artifacts associated with women or with men in a housing unit is a telltale sign of a living space segregated by sex, and therefore a likely coresidence; those units with a balance of women's and men's artifacts have the earmarks of a household. I hypothesize that changes in the scale of resource consumption and in the gender makeup at Utopia potentially will be reflected in the artifact patterns generated by each housing unit, and these differences may herald the degree of household development or complexity.

Resource Consumption Patterns in Utopia's Archaeological Record

Like architecture and sub-floor pits, residency groups have two dimensions: a form and a function. Archaeologists have developed methods to interpret some of the functions of residency groups, identifying such activities as craft production, modes of consumption, and processes of reproduction (see Wilk and Netting 1984; Wilk 1990; Tringham 1991; Wattenmaker 1994). Interpretive techniques also allow archaeologists to characterize some of the forms of residency groups such as their size, complexity, and gender composition (see Flannery and Winter 1976; Netting 1982; Hendon 1996). In some cases past researchers have neglected to differentiate between a household and a coresidential group, referencing all housing units or dwellings as households. However, based on the definitions I have outlined in Chapter 2, a household is "a group of people that shares in a maximum definable number of activities," whereas a coresidential unit consists of "a group of people who regularly share living quarters" (Ashmore and Wilk 1988:6). In other words, members of households share activities, while coresidential groups share space, and herein may be one of the keys to differentiating between

households and coresident groups in the archaeological record: the concepts of sharing and group cooperation.

One of the more significant sociocultural phenomena that sets apart a household from a coresident group, at least in theory, is group cooperation. Members of households cooperate, interacting and sharing responsibilities for the good of the group, whereas coresident groups share only the roof over their heads and do not join forces to accomplish tasks. Households are comprised of friends and family members allied together; coresident groups consist of strangers who may be competing for limited resources. Presumably, over time coresident groups are inclined, and it is to the advantage of each member, to transform into a household. Households are more efficient economic units, the division of labor benefits each member, they facilitate the acquisition and consumption of goods, and household infrastructure can provide intangible qualities such as emotional support.

Given the incentives of household membership, one can assume that, if they could choose, the residents of Utopia would have preferred to live in households rather than coresident groups. Gradually, planters recognized the advantages to providing slaves with the opportunities to form households as well. In the early years at Utopia, and at other Chesapeake quarters, slaves frequently had no choice and were forced to live in coresident groups, among strangers. Under adverse conditions people were compelled to form households by making alliances and learning to cooperate with each other. In many cases, what might have begun as a coresident group was converted by the will of the inhabitants to a functioning household. During the transition from coresident group to household, the degree of cooperation within each housing unit differed depending upon

circumstances. As alliances formed, some members may have functioned as a household together, to the exclusion of others, making some households fully articulated, while others were in the process of reaching household status. Overall, there is strong supporting historical evidence that, in general, the level of cooperation among slaves steadily increased over time at most Chesapeake slave quarter sites, including Utopia (see Kulikoff 1986:352-380).

A contemporary ethnographic scenario might be the most effective approach to begin considering how a fully integrated, cooperating household might have functioned on the ground as opposed to a group of strangers coresiding together. Consider the consumption and acquisition patterns of a family of four living in a household compared to four unrelated, coresiding college students living next door. In terms of consumable items, the family's refrigerator will contain one carton of milk, whereas there may be four cartons of milk, one for each college student. In fact, the four college students probably maintain their own stores of food and condiments as well as separate toiletries, and other disposable goods. The family next door, in comparison, will be sharing many of these same resources, thereby using only one bottle of shampoo, one bottle of detergent, etc., at one time. From an archaeological perspective the short-term consumption habits of the modern-day family and the coresident group of college students as represented by the contents of the trash set out at the curb each week may differ considerably.

Over the long-term, however, the trash produced by the two modern residency units may not be all that dissimilar. For example, the family of four will go through the same amount of shampoo as the four college students, but will be placing used shampoo bottles into the trash at a faster rate. Thus, on a weekly basis the trash may appear

different, but over a month or a year, the two groups will consume a similar amount and the disposal patterns will look alike. In terms of consumable goods the key factor is the size of the residency group; more members create more trash, whether a household or coresidence.

Contrary to consumables, the disposal patterns for non-consumable goods that are curated for long periods of time and used frequently—things such as pots and pans, dinner plates, eating utensils, furnishings, and appliances—may be significantly different between households and coresidences. For example, the family of four will have one set of dishes, while the college students likely have four. If an inventory was taken of both modern housing units, the coresidence occupied by college students may have a greater number of some disposable and non-disposable goods compared to the family living in the household because the college students make up four small, individual “households” under one roof, whereas the family just one big one. From this perspective, the coresidence temporarily might appear to be superior to the family household in terms of consumption.

While sharing might reduce the amount of some specific types of goods in households and increased them in coresidencies, over the life cycle the economic performance of a household outdistances that of coresidence. Cooperation among members of a household as well as central organization and a division of labor facilitates the acquisition of additional goods, improves the ability of the group to consume, creates the potential for a surplus, and eventually results in an increase of disposable materials emanating from the housing unit (see Douglas and Isherwood 1979; Becker 1981; McCracken 1988; Nelson 1988; Deaton and Paxton 1998; Gibson 2002; Horowitz 2002;

Blacklow and Ray 2003). As an economic unit, the family household exceeds the sum of individual consumption and production by members of a coresidence. Therefore, for our family of four and the college students, signs of these economic variations, some subtle some not so subtle, can be found in the garage, the backyard, and in every room of house, and eventually these variations make their way into the trash can.

How might this hypothetical modern ethnographic example translate to the trash pits of an 18th-century Chesapeake slave quarter site? Did resource pooling in Utopia's households diminish the amount of discarded goods from them, or did the synergy and efficiency of the household as an economic unit override whatever sharing took place and produce a surplus? Should we expect to find more artifacts from households or coresidential groups, and if there are clear-cut differences, which artifacts will demonstrate the pattern? In theory members of Utopia's households shared much of their disposable and non-disposable provisions. Like the modern example, on a given day a visitor might have found one felling axe in a Utopia household, a case of shared, community property, but find several axes that were considered personal property in a coresidency setting. However, over the long-term the household was much more capable of acquiring and replacing axes than individuals in a coresidence, and producing a surplus of them. And eventually more of those discarded axes should have found their way into the archaeological record of Utopia's households.

Potential Impediments to Isolating Resource Consumption Patterns

If this theory of household consumption holds at Utopia I believe an efficiently organized household will have generated larger quantities of most goods compared to coresiding individuals subsisting autonomously, and these differences will be visible in

the archaeological record. Yet, complicating factors may make conclusive proof of these differing artifact disposal patterns difficult to demonstrate with the evidence at hand. Growth of a global economy and an availability of goods, varying plantation rationing systems, and differences in the scale of data from comparative archaeological contexts all are factors that can potentially obscure the resource consumption patterns at Utopia.

A consumer revolution of sorts occurred throughout the western world in the 18th century and as part of its trickle-down effect the residents of Utopia during the fourth occupation phase (ca. 1750 to 1775) had greater access to a range of goods and services not available to earlier generations (see Carson 1994). As a result of this, the typical housing unit at Utopia in 1770, regardless of its residency type, may have generated more artifacts on average than earlier housing units at the beginning of the century. Also, plantation diversification and changing 18th-century management practices created more opportunities for some slaves to acquire skills, learn a trade, or take on additional responsibilities, and this in turn increased some slaves' use and acquisition of goods. Overall, Chesapeake slaves were able to raise their standard of living as the 18th century progressed, and this economic impetus to consume, ranging from mundane glass bottles to specialized goods such as furnishings or apparel, may obscure our ability to differentiate between households and coresident groups.

Another factor to consider is the type of rationing system employed by each owner. Most Chesapeake slaveholders allocated at least a minimal set of equipment to each quarter (see Walsh 1997:90-93). Others may have been more generous and provided more supplies. According to James Bray II's inventory, he provided an iron

cooking pot to each outlying quarter, and whatever else was considered valueless (see Appendix C). Goods normally were distributed to quarters, and less frequently to individual housing units, but only rarely were resources earmarked for individual people or families. In the early 18th century food usually was apportioned to a quarter to be distributed by an overseer or by the slaves themselves. As management systems changed in the latter 18th century, rations were more closely controlled and doled out to families or individuals. Thus, the scale of disposable and non-disposable goods recovered from Utopia may not necessarily represent the consumer habits of the residents, but rather the type of allotment system preferred by Pettus, the Brays, and Burwell, and this must be taken into account during the analysis.

From an archaeological perspective the amount of data collected from each occupation period or housing unit are influenced by the number and volume of the features associated with each of them. In some cases the number of features and the magnitude of feature soil varied widely, like comparing buckets to barrels. For example, in Period 2 the volume of excavated features in Structure 10 was much greater than Structures 1 and 20 combined, and Structure 10 produced 50 percent more artifacts than Structure 1 and 30 percent more than Structure 20 (see Table 7.2). Evidently this had an impact on the artifact patterns, especially when comparing the quantity of specific materials from two contexts. Thus one has to bear in mind that whatever seemingly significant differences emerge when comparing the data may be caused by a variety of factors—the growth of consumerism, the type of rationing system employed at each plantation, and the density and volume of features from each context—not necessarily contrasting residency patterns. However, analysis can be structured to account for some

of these factors and to moderate their effect on the data.

To organize her study of slave families and households in 19th-century Louisiana, Ann Malone adopted a typology comprised of five principal family/household types: simple family households, solitaire households, non-nuclear family households, extended family households, and multiple family households (1992:7-8; see Chapter 2). Simple family households are the most advanced residential form, the living situation to which most individuals aspired, whereas a group of solitaires was the least advanced form, equivalent to a coresidential group (Figure 8.1). One can make the case that if placed on a continuum simple family households were the most highly organized and efficient type of economic unit, a group of solitaires residing together lacked central organization and were the least efficient unit, and multiple family households would fall somewhere in between, perhaps divided into two or more subgroups allied together (see Figure 8.1).² In terms of artifact patterns, with members pooling their resources, simple family households will generate a greater number of selected artifact types in the archaeological record; a group of solitaires, with individuals maintaining separate stores of provisions and not working together for the common good will produce lower relative quantities of some materials; and limited efficiency would have occurred in multifamily households, creating an artifact assemblage that might have some characteristics in common with the other two types (see Figure 8.1).

Based on these hypothesized patterns of resource consumption, a comparison of selected artifact types at Utopia may be capable of revealing the contours of residential

² Here non-nuclear family households and extended family households can be grouped with simple family households because they too contained members who were related to one another or allied together and would be expected to cooperate in household affairs.

organization. The task of interpreting potential residency patterns is aided by the fact that, thus far, the architectural and sub-floor pit analysis conducted in previous chapters strongly suggests that Structures 10 and 50 functioned as barracks and probably housed coresident groups. The other seven dwelling units exhibit no obvious signs of coresidency based on architecture and sub-floor pits and were more likely to be inhabited by a variant of a household.

Tracking Resource Consumption at Utopia

All the 93,664 artifacts recovered from Utopia in the 1990s were logged into a relational Access computer database. From these a total of 213 different artifact types were identified in the Utopia collection, ranging from adzes to worked bone. From these I culled 52 types of objects (a total of 374 items) that when put into use were intended to perform specific functions to fulfill a need or accomplish a task (e.g., hammers for driving nails, gunflints for igniting gunpowder, table spoons for conveying food to the mouth, padlocks for securing property) (see Binford 1962a; Deetz 1996:74-75) (Table 8.1). The 374 objects will allow me to test the principal of household and coresidential consumption outlined above. There was a strong likelihood that household members would have pooled many of the 374 objects as community property, whereas members of a coresidency would have maintained ownership of the items as private property, reluctant to share them, perhaps even hoarding them from other coresidency members. What is being tested here is the impact of private property ownership (coresidency consumption) versus resource pooling (household consumption). I hypothesize that the 374 objects represent resource consumption patterns and will be more abundant in those

housing units at Utopia that functioned as households because households were more powerful units of consumption than coresident groups.

Table 8.1. Artifact types and sub-groups representing resource consumption.

Type	Total	%	Type	Total	%
Adze	1	0.3%	Gun Barrel	5	1.3%
Auger	3	0.8%	Gun Lock Part	2	0.5%
Axe	3	0.8%	Gunflint	6	1.6%
Axe, Broad	1	0.3%	Firearms	13	3.4%
Barking Spud	1	0.3%	Fishing Awl	2	0.5%
Chisel	7	1.9%	Fishhook	5	1.3%
Cutting Tool	17	4.5%	Fishing Weight	8	2.1%
Drawknife	3	0.8%	Fishing Tackle	15	3.9%
File/Rasp	11	2.9%	Fork	4	1.1%
Froe	1	0.3%	Table Knife	55	14.7%
Gimlet	4	1.1%	Spoon	74	19.8%
Gouge	4	1.1%	Eating Utensils	133	35.6%
Hammer	1	0.3%	Iron Pestle	1	0.3%
Hatchet	2	0.5%	Ladle	1	0.3%
Lath Hammer	2	0.5%	Strainer	3	0.8%
Ruler/Measure	1	0.3%	Cooking Fork	1	0.3%
Saw Blade	2	0.5%	Frying Pan	5	1.3%
Shim	1	0.3%	Handmill	1	0.3%
Shovel	3	0.8%	Pothook	7	1.9%
Spade	2	0.5%	Kitchen Equip.	19	5.2%
Spokeshave	1	0.3%	Candlestick	2	0.5%
Stockknife	1	0.3%	Tobacco Box	6	1.6%
Unidentified Tools	12	3.2%	Smoker's Companion	4	1.1%
Wedge	1	0.3%	Comb	3	0.8%
Weight	1	0.3%	Key	11	2.9%
Construction Tools	86	23.2%	Folding Knife	13	3.5%
Hoe	31	8.3%	Padlock	14	3.7%
Scythe	3	0.8%	Scissors	19	5.1%
Sickle	2	0.5%	Miscellaneous	72	19.2%
Agricultural Tools	36	9.6%	TOTALS	374	100.1%

Each of the 374 items tallied in Table 8.1 represents an individual object. For example, there were 19 discrete pairs of scissors recovered from Utopia, not simply 19 scissors fragments. In a series of preliminary tests conducted with the full Utopia dataset I encountered problems when measuring abundance in the archaeological record with fragments. It became apparent that whatever variation emerged from the tests largely was due to differing rates of use and breakage, not from socio-cultural behavior. This was especially evident with glass and ceramic fragments which made up nearly two-thirds of the domestic artifacts. In other words, the numbers simply proved the obvious: that glass bottles and ceramics broke into more pieces than other types of material. One glass wine bottle could create hundreds of chips of glass, each counted as an artifact, whereas a scissors might break into two or three pieces.³ To overcome the skewing effect of glass and ceramic breakage, I chose artifact types that represent complete objects. The 52 types of objects are resilient to the effects of breakage (none of them shatter when dropped), and therefore more realistically represent resource consumption rates at Utopia when compared between different contexts.

The 52 object types were sorted into seven subgroups: construction tools, agricultural tools, firearms, fishing tackle, eating utensils, kitchen equipment, and miscellaneous (see Table 8.1). These seven subgroups represent specific forms of resource consumption: construction and agricultural tools for resource production,

³ All the glass and ceramic fragments were examined in an attempt to determine a minimum number of vessels (MNV). However, most of the ceramics were undecorated and produced low MNVs. For example, from a collection of nearly 1,800 ceramic sherds from Period 3 less than 20 vessels could be confidently identified, meaning Period 3 produced more construction tools than ceramic vessels. And only bases and necks could be used with the glass bottles, and again these produced unrealistically low MNVs. Thus, analyzed as fragments bottles and ceramics were overrepresented, analyzed as objects and they were underrepresented. The solution for now was to set aside these types of domestic material.

firearms and fishing tackle for resource procurement, eating utensils for food consumption, kitchen equipment for food preparation, and miscellaneous items for a variety of social functions. Again, I hypothesize that these subgroups of artifacts will pattern differently in the archaeological record of coresident groups and households. Consequently, when compared between occupation periods and most importantly between housing units the varying patterns among the seven subgroups may signal differing residency forms.

The Seven Subgroups of Resource Consumption

The 86 tools in the construction tools group are comprised of 25 different types and together comprise 23 percent of the dataset (see Table 8.1). Cutting tools (unidentified iron blades intended for cutting or scraping) made up the highest number in the subgroup ($n=17$), followed by unidentified tools ($n=12$), and files/rasps ($n=11$). Tools allowed slaves to perform essential tasks and for that reason they would have been protected and valued, in contrast to agricultural tools that were often abused. A residential group outfitted with a set of tools had an advantage over other groups that lacked them. Households would have been likely to pool their tools, sharing them and using them as community property. Individuals living in a coresidence simply were less capable of acquiring or maintaining large sets of tools, although sometimes a coresidency might have contained several examples of the same tool. Thus, households are expected to deposit more tools in the archaeological record than coresidences.

Iron hoes were the most common tool recovered from Utopia and dominated the agricultural tool subgroup ($n=31$), followed by scythes ($n=3$), and sickles ($n=2$) (see Table 8.1). The subgroup makes up 9.6 percent of the dataset. The principal implement

used for tending tobacco and corn, slaves had little impetus to curate hoes carefully.

In fact, hoes routinely broke, and many slave owners found reason to believe that the high breakage rate was not accidental. It is unclear whether each person was responsible for an individual hoe, or whether a bundle of hoes were parceled out to each quarter or each housing unit. Whatever the case, it is possible that agricultural tools will pattern differently than construction tools in the archaeological record, particularly given the fact that all of Utopia's residents had ready access to them. An abundance of hoes from a particular housing unit may indicate where the agricultural tools regularly were stored, perhaps because an authority figure or driver was in residence, or it may suggest a large group in residence, either a household or coresident group.

Although laws were on the books prohibiting enslaved Africans from possessing firearms without a permit (Hening 1969:II:481-482), archaeological evidence of guns at slave quarter sites is relatively common in the region (Walsh 1997:91). A planter could decide either to undertake the burden of provisioning his field slaves with the necessary victuals, or outfit them with firearms to allow them to hunt and forage for themselves. Based on the gun parts ($n=7$) and gunflints ($n=6$) at Utopia, evidently the site's owners elected the second course of action and some Utopia residents were in possession of firearms (see Table 8.1). Guns must have been highly prized, and it is difficult to imagine a member of a coresident group possessing one. Rather, it is likely that guns were dispensed to a household head or driver who could assume responsibility for it. Therefore, I believe the presence of firearms is more probable to be found in household settings rather than coresidencies.

organized household could have chosen to pool their eating utensils, creating what is

Fishing was an activity that provided an important dietary supplement for Utopia's residents and the site produced evidence of this in the form of fishhooks ($n=5$), line and net weights ($n=8$), and two awls carved from animal horn used to weave and repair fishing nets (see Table 8.1). Fishing poles easily could be fashioned from saplings, weights and sinkers made from scrap lead, and a little bartering could produce a fishhook or two. Most individuals at Utopia probably owned a pole and fishing tackle, and fishing poles may have been one of the more common personal possessions. Because of availability, it was not necessary and to no real advantage for household members to share fishing poles and tackle, and I presume that evidence of it is just as likely to be recovered from households as coresidencies.

A total of 133 eating utensils were recovered from Utopia, accounting for more than one-third of the entire dataset (see Table 8.1). More than half of the eating utensils were spoons ($n=74$), followed by table knives ($n=55$), and a few forks ($n=4$). At minimum most individuals probably possessed a spoon with which to eat meals and there seems to have been no advantage for a household to share eating utensils to save on resources, nor was there an obvious advantage for a coresidential group member to possess more than one set of eating utensils (see Deetz 1996:168-170). Several of the pewter spoons had been incised and marked in an effort to personalize them, or a hole had been punched in the handle so it could hang around the neck on a cord. Several bone handled knives displayed evidence of carving as well. This suggests that some of Utopia's residents considered eating utensils to be personal possessions (see also Klingelhofer 1987; Franklin 1997:239-241). However, to improve efficiency an organized household could have chosen to pool their eating utensils, creating what is

tantamount to a modern "silverware drawer." By doing so, the household eventually may have been able to generate a surplus. Instead of a one-to-one ratio in a coresidential group, households could have reached a ratio of two- or three-to-one of spoons or knives for each member. Based on this reasoning, I suspect that households placed more eating utensils into the archaeological record.

Utopia produced 19 pieces of equipment used in the preparation of meals (see Table 8.1). Although the numbers are small, I expect that a household had a greater capacity to acquire and use these types of specialized equipment. All 19 artifacts—an iron pestle, a ladle, strainers, a cooking fork, frying pans, a handmill for grinding corn, and pothooks—are specifically designed for preparing or processing food, and it is unlikely that many of these types of goods would find their way into the hands of members of coresident groups. Coresidencies simply could not feed themselves as well, nor did they have the resources to stock the kitchen. For them, food preparation often occurred off premises, from an outdoor cooking pot or kitchen nearby. Households with the wherewithal to organize and prepare regular meals were more reliant on specialized kitchen gear, and I expect to find more of it in those settings.

The final set of eight artifact types is a miscellaneous subgroup of 72 items, goods that were not essential for daily living, but would have enhanced the quality of life in some small way (see Table 8.1). Because candlesticks, combs, folding knives (pocketknives), and the like were not necessities, they could be considered surplus goods, things that an organized household was better equipped to acquire due to a division of labor that could generate leisure time. Members of coresidential groups were responsible for providing for themselves and had little downtime to expend energy to acquire non-

essential goods, especially when getting oneself fed was chore enough. Surely members of coresident groups possessed some of these miscellaneous items as personal property, but in general I believe more of them will be found in households.

Overall, I expect households will produce a greater quantity of artifacts for five of the seven artifact subgroups in the dataset (Table 8.2). Coresident groups are not projected to generate abundance in any of the seven subgroups. Both household and coresidency members had equal access to agricultural tools and fishing tackle, meaning I do not anticipate a profusion of either subgroup to be found in households or coresident groups (see Table 8.2).

Table 8.2. Expected abundances of resource consumption groups.

Type	Construction Tools	Agricultural Tools	Firearms	Fishing Tackle	Eating Utensils	Kitchen Equipment	Miscellaneous
Simple Family Household	▲		▲		▲	▲	▲
Coresident Group							

Resource Consumption among the Four Occupation Periods

To establish a baseline for the analysis of the ten housing units to follow, let us briefly consider how the consumption artifact groups array themselves among the four occupation periods (Table 8.3).⁴ Nearly 44 percent of the dataset artifacts were recovered from Period 4, almost eight times the amount from Period 1. In fact, the average amount

⁴ Note that the upper layers of the well (KM309-KM312) contained artifacts attributable to both Periods 1 and 2, and therefore Period 1/2 was created to account for this.

of goods steadily rises over time from Period 1 to Period 4 (Figure 8.2). Except for a precipitous drop in firearms between Periods 3 and 4, and a slight decline in fishing tackle as well, the remaining five subgroup artifact types progressively increase from Period 1 to Period 4 (see Figure 8.2). Period 4 produced more construction and agricultural tools than all the other periods combined, and generated around 40 percent of the other subgroups except for firearms (see Table 8.3). Period 3 registered high percentages of firearms and fishing tackle, and was second to Period 4 in all the other categories. Even if the Period 1/2 artifacts were combined with Period 1 or Period 2, neither of these earliest occupation periods would have exceeded Periods 3 and 4 (see Table 8.3).

Table 8.3. Distribution of subgrouped resource consumption artifacts among Utopia's four occupation periods.

	Construction Tools	Agricultural Tools	Firearms	Fishing Tackle	Eating Utensils	Kitchen Equipment	Miscellaneous	Total
Per 1	3 (3.5%)	2 (5.6%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (6.0%)	1 (5.3%)	6 (8.3%)	21 (5.6%)
Per 1/2	3 (3.5%)	5 (13.9%)	2 (15.4%)	1 (6.7%)	14 (10.5%)	3 (15.8%)	7 (9.7%)	35 (9.4%)
Per 2	10 (11.6%)	2 (5.6%)	2 (15.4%)	1 (6.7%)	25 (18.8%)	3 (15.8%)	10 (13.9%)	53 (14.2%)
Per 3	25 (29.1%)	7 (19.4%)	7 (53.8%)	7 (46.7%)	34 (25.6%)	4 (21.1%)	17 (23.6%)	101 (27.0%)
Per 4	45 (52.3%)	20 (55.6%)	1 (7.7%)	6 (40.0%)	52 (39.1%)	8 (42.1%)	32 (44.4%)	164 (43.9%)
Total	86 (100%)	36 (100%)	13 (100%)	15 (100%)	133 (100%)	19 (100%)	72 (100%)	374 (100%)

One might simply conclude from Table 8.3 and Figure 8.2 that Utopia's slaves gradually transitioned from coresident groups during Periods 1 and 2 to full-fledged

households by Periods 3 and 4. However, as mentioned earlier, a proliferation of consumer goods reached into every level of Chesapeake society in the years leading up to the American Revolution and this very well may be the cause of the spikes in commodities in the final two occupation periods. Even if slaves were given little opportunity to participate in a market economy, goods indirectly made their way out to the slave quarters. For instance, James Bray II was a prosperous man by standards of the early 18th century, but his wealth was dwarfed in comparison with Lewis Burwell IV 50 years later. According to his Period 2 inventory, Bray outfitted each of his outlying slave quarters with an iron pot and little else. It is not known what standard issue was for Burwell's slaves in Period 4; however, several fragments of expensive delftware plates with a distinctive peacock design on them were recovered from Period 4, plates that were identical to examples recovered from Burwell's Kingsmill mansion (Kelso 1977:76, 78). This finding would seem to give credibility to the idea that there was a direct connection between the consumer habits of a planter and the consumer goods found in the quarters through the process of hand-me-downs. We need to look inside each occupation period and identify possible consumption patterns within the ten housing units to arrive at a better approximation of residency types over time at Utopia.

Resource Consumption among the Ten Housing Units

Not all of the 374 dataset artifacts were recovered from contexts directly associated with one of Utopia's ten housing units. Objects from the well, trash pits, and other various contexts could not be firmly associated with a particular housing unit, and therefore had to be eliminated from this stage of analysis. The remaining 281 objects again were divided into the seven resource consumption subgroups and separated into the

ten housing unit contexts as illustrated in Table 8.4. The table presents the subgroup frequencies for each housing unit and the relative percentages. The total percentage of resource consumption artifacts produced by each housing unit is displayed in bar chart form in Figure 8.3. The percentages of goods increase over time, but in what might be described as two tiers. In the upper tier, artifact frequencies regularly rise by approximately 60 percent each time from 7.5 percent for the Utopia Cottage, to Structure 10, Structure 40, and finally to Duplex 1 which produced the highest proportion of artifacts at 28.5 percent (see Figure 8.3). These four housing units yielded more than two-thirds of the artifacts in the dataset. The four lower tier housing units also show a regular increase in artifacts from 2.1 percent for Structure 1 to Structure 20, Structure 50, and topping out at Duplex 2 at 15.3 percent (see Figure 8.3). Structures 150 contained no artifacts whatsoever, and Structure 160 contributed only two artifacts which registered a paltry 0.7 percent of the dataset (see Table 8.4).

Because of a lack of data in some cells, and a low output for some of the subgroups (e.g., eight firearms variables), the data were ranked in each subgroup on a descending scale of ten (highest) to one (lowest) in an attempt to smooth it out (Table 8.5). The rankings were then added together to form a rank sum for each housing unit, and those sums were placed in bar chart form (Figure 8.4). The bar chart of the ranks changes the outlook of the data in two major respects: Structure 40 achieves an equal ranking in the highest position with Duplex 1, and the differences between Structures 10, 50, and Duplex 2 are leveled out so that five of the housing units are clustered at the top of the rankings (see Figure 8.4). Structures 1, 20, 150, and 160 form a group of units that are close to one another in proportion at the bottom of the rankings, and the Utopia

Table 8.4. Distribution of resource consumption artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units.

	Construction Tools	Agricultural Tools	Firearms	Fishing Tackle	Eating Utensils	Kitchen Equipment	Misc.	Total
Cottage	3 (4.8%)	2 (10.0%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (7.1%)	1 (6.3%)	6 (12.2%)	21 (7.5%)
Structure 1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.1%)	6 (2.1%)
Structure 10	6 (9.5%)	2 (10.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (7.7%)	15 (13.4%)	3 (18.8%)	7 (14.3%)	36 (12.8%)
Structure 20	5 (7.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (4.6%)
Structure 40	11 (17.5%)	3 (15.0%)	2 (25.0%)	5 (38.5%)	24 (21.4%)	1 (6.3%)	7 (14.3%)	53 (18.9%)
Structure 50	6 (9.5%)	3 (15.0%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (15.4%)	7 (6.3%)	3 (18.8%)	4 (8.2%)	27 (9.6%)
Duplex 140-1	22 (34.9%)	7 (35.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (23.1%)	32 (28.6%)	2 (12.5%)	14 (28.6%)	80 (28.5%)
Duplex 140-2	9 (14.3%)	3 (15.0%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (15.4%)	13 (11.6%)	6 (37.5%)	9 (18.4%)	43 (15.3%)
Structure 150	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Structure 160	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.7%)
Total	63 (100%)	20 (100%)	8 (100%)	13 (100%)	112 (100%)	16 (100%)	49 (100%)	281 (100%)

Table 8.5. Ranks of resource consumption artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units.

	Construction Tools	Agricultural Tools	Firearms	Fishing Tackle	Eating Utensils	Kitchen Equipment	Misc.	Rank Sum	Mean Rank
Cottage	4	6	7	5	6	6	6	40	6
Structure 1	2	4	5	5	3	4	4	27	8
Structure 10	7	6	10	6	8	9	8	54	4
Structure 20	5	4	5	5	6	4	3	32	7
Structure 40	9	9	10	10	9	6	8	61	1
Structure 50	7	9	10	8	4	9	5	52	5
Duplex 140-1	10	10	5	9	10	7	10	61	1
Duplex 140-2	8	9	7	9	7	10	9	59	3
Structure 150	2	4	5	5	1	4	3	24	10
Structure 160	3	4	5	5	2	4	3	26	9

Cottage falls somewhere in middle between the high and low groups. The bar chart clearly demonstrates that the distribution of consumption resources at Utopia is marked by the haves and the have nots. Having illustrated the general rise in resource consumption at Utopia over time (see Figure 8.2), this same phenomenon is visible for both the percentages and ranks among the housing units (see Figures 8.3 and 8.4). Again, the principal reason for the regular increase in the percentages of artifacts from Period 1 to Period 4 may be due to the advancement of consumerism throughout the Chesapeake in the 18th century. To compensate for the possible effects of an improving standard of living in the 18th century, let us compare the consumer patterns between the housing units within Periods 2, 3, and 4 separately. Presumably the residents of each occupation period had equal access to available goods, which should eliminate the skewing effect of growing consumerism in the latter occupation periods. However, the issue of differing scales of data still plagues the analysis. Housing units with the highest volume of features tend to register the highest number of consumer goods. This can be compensated for partially by calculating the density of consumer artifacts per cubic foot of each housing unit's SFPs (volume of soil) (Figure 8.5).

Period 2

The three housing units in Period 2 yielded 55 resource consumption goods (Table 8.6). Two-thirds of those goods came from Structure 10, 24 percent from Structure 20, and 11 percent from Structure 1. Structure 10 produced goods in all seven resource consumption subgroups, whereas the other two housing units generated values in only two of the subgroups (see Table 8.6). From this it would be tempting to put

forward that Structure 10 was a fully operational household, and the other two much less productive coresidential units. Yet, as mentioned earlier, this is a case where Structure 10's domination of the other two housing units may be a product of the volume of its features. In fact, the volume of the SFPs in Structure 10 was greater than Structures 1 and 20 combined (see Table 7.2). By looking at the density of goods by feature volume, Structure 20 proved to have the highest percentage of goods at 0.385 artifacts per cubic foot of feature fill. Structure 10 was close behind at 0.292 artifacts per cubic foot, and Structure 1 yielded goods at a rate of only 0.081 per cubic foot (see Figure 8.5). Thus, once the data is leveled out to account for feature volume, Structure 20 seems to have functioned as a household, whereas Structures 1 and 10 produced lower percentages of goods by volume, suggesting their use by coresident groups, particularly Structure 1.

Table 8.6. Distribution of subgroup artifacts among the Period 2 housing units.

	Construction Tools	Agricultural Tools	Firearms	Fishing Tackle	Eating Utensils	Kitchen Equipment	Misc.	Total	Ratio of Goods by Volume
Str 1	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 14.8%	0 0.0%	2 22.2%	6 10.9%	.081
Str 10	6 54.5%	2 100%	2 100%	1 100%	15 55.6%	3 100%	7 77.8%	36 65.5%	.292
Str 20	5 45.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 29.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13 23.6%	.385
Total	11 20.0%	2 3.6%	2 3.6%	1 1.8%	27 49.1%	3 5.5%	9 16.4%	55 100%	.238

nearly Period 3 came from Duplex 1, one-third from Duplex 2, only 1.6 percent from

Structure The comparison of Structures 40 and 50 in Period 3 appears to demonstrate a

clearer picture of contrasting resource consumption patterns between the two housing

units. Structure 40 produced two-thirds of the 80 consumption goods for Period 3, Structure 50 the remaining one-third (Table 8.7). Twice as many construction tools, fishing tackle, and miscellaneous items came from Structure 40, and three times as many eating utensils. Structure 50 only outpaced Structure 40 in one category, kitchen equipment (see Table 8.7). Significantly, Structure 40 yielded consumer artifacts at a rate of 0.716 artifacts per cubic foot, whereas Structure 50 turned out artifacts at a rate of 0.099 per cubic foot (see Figure 8.5), even though the volume of features in Structure 50 was more than triple that of Structure 40 (see Table 7.3). Given these resource consumption profiles, Structure 40 has all the appearances of a household, and Structure 50 a coresident group.

Table 8.7. Distribution of subgroup artifacts among the Period 3 housing units.

	Construction Tools	Agricultural Tools	Firearms	Fishing Tackle	Eating Utensils	Kitchen Equipment	Misc.	Total	Ratio of Goods by Volume
Str 40	11 64.7%	3 50%	2 50%	5 71.4%	24 77.4%	1 25%	7 63.6%	53 66.3%	.716
Str 50	6 35.3%	3 50%	2 50%	2 28.6%	7 22.6%	3 75%	4 36.4%	27 33.8%	.099
Total	11 20.0%	2 3.6%	2 3.6%	1 1.8%	27 49.1%	3 5.5%	9 16.4%	80 100%	.231

Period 4

Of the 125 resource consumption goods from the four Period 4 housing units, nearly two-thirds came from Duplex 1, one-third from Duplex 2, only 1.6 percent from Structure 160, and Structure 150 failed to register a single resource consumption item (Table 8.8). Comparing the two duplexes for the moment, more than twice the number of

construction tools, agricultural tools, and eating utensils were recovered from Duplex 1, and more fishing tackle and miscellaneous items as well, whereas Duplex 2 exceeded Duplex 1 in the categories of firearms and kitchen equipment (see Table 8.8). In terms of the percentage of consumption artifacts by volume of SFP soil, although Duplex 2 had 68 percent more volume of soil, Duplex 1 produced 0.363 artifacts per cubic foot, and Duplex 2 yielded 0.134 artifacts per cubic foot, a nearly three-fold advantage for Duplex 1 (see Figure 8.5). A persuasive argument could be made that these patterns exemplify a fully articulated household in Duplex 1 and a loosely confederated coresident group in Duplex 2. As for Structures 150 and 160, the jury is still out. Neither housing unit was inhabited as intensively as the duplex, making it difficult to characterize the type of residency group that produced the archaeological deposits, although by percentage of goods by volume Structure 160 ($n=0.119$) was on par with Duplex 2.

Table 8.8. Distribution of subgroup artifacts among the Period 4 housing units.

	Construction Tools	Agricultural Tools	Firearms	Fishing Tackle	Eating Utensils	Kitchen Equipment	Misc.	Total	Ratio of Goods by Volume
Dup 1	22 68.8%	7 70%	0 0.0%	3 60%	32 69.6%	2 25%	14 60.9%	80 64.0%	.363
Dup 2	9 28.1%	3 30%	1 100%	2 40%	13 28.3%	6 75%	9 39.1%	43 34.4%	.134
Str 150	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	.000
Str 160	1 3.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 2.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 1.6%	.119
Total	32 25.6%	10 8.0%	1 0.8%	5 4.0%	46 36.8%	8 6.4%	23 18.4%	125 100%	.212

The differences between Duplex 1 and 2 may be due in part to a widening divide in the social order among Chesapeake slaves. By the second half of the 18th century some slaves were able to elevate their economic standing among their enslaved brethren, creating a nascent internal class system. The most visible social schism occurred between slaves working in the main house and those laboring in the fields. Eventually social divisions surfaced in the quarters, often derived from the assignment of different tasks, and it was the achievement of different socio-economic ranks that impacted the rates of resource consumption between slave households. Those households on the top of the social hierarchy heap could consume more resources, which potentially translated to higher levels of consumer goods in the archaeological record. Especially given the fact that the Period 4 duplex units were nearly the same size, and sub-floor pits were similarly arrayed in both, it would appear that the same type of group inhabited each side of the duplex, but that the degree of economic influence differed between them. Therefore it is entirely possible that both duplexes functioned as households, and the variation between the resource consumption goods from Duplex 1 and 2 are a consequence of differing economic capacity.

Overall, the resource consumption patterns identified for Periods 2, 3, and 4 conform to most expectations. For Period 2 the artifact distributions suggest that Structures 20, and to a lesser degree Structure 10, functioned as the most productive economic units, and both may have been populated by members of households, whereas Structure 1 generated far fewer goods, and therefore appears to be coresidential in form. Yet, questions remain and the Period 2 consumption patterns spawn more questions than answers at this point, particularly regarding the function of Structure 10. For Period 3,

given the evident differences in the assemblages of consumer goods, Structure 40 appears to have functioned as a household in comparison to Structure 50 as a coresidence. And for the final occupation period, although the differences between the artifact assemblages in Duplex 1 and 2 are nearly identical to the two-thirds to one-third split between Structures 40 and 50, the duplexes are almost a mirror image of each other in terms of size and sub-floor pitting patterns. This has led me to conclude that both duplexes contained households, a high status household in Duplex 1 and a lower status household in Duplex 2. Due to a lack of data from Structures 150 and 160 to form consumer patterns, any conclusions as to residency type must remain speculative. An alternative line of inquiry might help resolve some of the more puzzling aspects of Period 2 and the other occupations as well, and thus in the next section we shall examine the artifact assemblage in terms of gender.

Signs of Men and Women in Utopia's Archaeological Record

The concept of gender also can be applied in an analytical manner to the Utopia artifact data in an effort to differentiate between households and coresident groups. If elevated levels of resource consumption are assumed to be inherent within well developed households, one also can surmise that in the majority of cases both men and women were present and contributing to the artifact assemblage. Presumably the members of a stable household would include a relatively balanced number of men and women, whereas coresidential groups were more likely to consist of predominantly one gender. Therefore, it is reasonable to identify those artifacts that justifiably can be associated with women or men, and investigate the patterns that they left behind.

In all settings, including the Utopia Quarter, gender norms were learned and adopted through interaction and experience. Slaves at Utopia fashioned their gender relations from two primary cultural sources, from Anglo-American gender norms that were imposed on them by their owners and overseers, and from their own remembered understanding of how men and women were supposed to interact from the assorted West and Central African cultures that converged at the site.

Anglo-American conceptions of gender in early 18th-century Virginia were recast by the colonial experience, but essentially remained similar to those found in England at the time. For instance, Anglo-Chesapeake women and men continued to labor in separate spheres—women primarily in the domestic realm and men outside of it (Brown 1996:24-25). Colonial housewifery generally centered on cooking, cleaning, washing, raising children, and gathering and preserving food (Brown 1996:25-27; Carr et al. 1991:72). Throughout the first half of the 18th century most Chesapeake slave owners assigned men and women to the same tasks (Brown 1996:119; Carr and Walsh 1988; Davis 1981:8; hooks 1981:45; White 1985:114). This arrangement directly contradicted many African social norms in which men and women spent a majority of their time apart from each other, at work and at leisure (Casey 1991:142; Mullin 1992:172). In fact, in the majority of African cultures women raised children with little or no help from their husbands, usually with the assistance of other women (Nash 1982:182; Sobel 1987:28; Fage 1989:154-155).

While early 18th-century masters enforced a similar daily work routine on men and women, most of them had little desire to disrupt life in the slave quarters as long as fieldwork kept apace, productivity remained high, and Old World ways of living did not

threaten a master's authority. Thus, when returning to the quarters after a day of toil in the fields, most Chesapeake slave populations were able to construct their own gender norms. Women tended to assumed the most active role in the domestic realm, cooking meals, cleaning, caring for children, and other such tasks that kept them in close proximity to the house. By virtue of this, women had a more significant physical presence at most Chesapeake slave quarters, and they played the key role in structuring the living environment within the domestic setting, whereas men focused their attention outside the site (Carr and Walsh 1988:182). In fact, given the traditional African segregation of male and female spheres of interaction, men may have spent the bulk of their leisure time fishing, hunting, visiting wives or relatives, or otherwise congregating away from the immediate confines of the home site when circumstances allowed it. At Chesapeake domestic slave sites, apparently many men were absent, or at the very least peripheral characters, while the women largely shaped the day-to-day interaction at the living quarters (Fesler 1997a; Heath and Bennett 2000). Whether this was the case at Utopia may be detectable among the patterns embedded in some forms of artifacts from the site.

Potential Impediments to Isolating Gender Patterns

Some of the same factors that complicated the interpretation of the resource consumption patterns at Utopia may muddy the gender patterns as well. Foremost among them, an expanding net of consumer goods was cast across the Chesapeake in the 18th century, causing an upsurge in the amount of commodities that reached even the most remote slave quarters. Some slaves found increasing opportunities to participate in the consumer economy in the second half of the 18th century, sometimes making small

purchases at local stores or bartering for goods (see Martin 1993; Heath 1999). As a result of these changing consumption patterns, archaeological sites dating to the latter 18th century tend to produce more artifacts than earlier sites, including those types of artifacts generally associated with activities conducted by women or by men.

The comparison of archaeological features with radically differing volumes presents the same problem for gender analysis as it did for resource consumption analysis. To account for this incongruity, instead of comparing artifact counts or percentages, it is important to determine the ratio of artifacts from different contexts. In this manner, artifacts from a massive sub-floor pit can be compared with those from a small pit without being distorted by differences in volume.

Isolating Gender at Utopia

Ascribing a particular set of data exclusively to women or to men is problematic. Based on a task differentiation framework devised by Janet Spector (1983), modified by James Gibb and Julie King (1991) on several Chesapeake sites, and with the guidance of a detailed farm diary kept by Virginia planter George Washington in the 1780s (Carr and Walsh 1988), some artifact types can be correlated with activities principally performed by women or by men. I chose six types of artifacts that under normal circumstances were more likely the domain of women, and six types expected to be the purview of men (Table 8.9). The women's assemblage is comprised of 814 artifacts, and the men's made up of 480 artifacts, producing a collection of 1,294 total "gendered" artifacts. Nearly two-thirds of the total ($n=62.9$ percent) are related to women, and one-third ($n=37.1$ percent) to men.

Table 8.9. Artifact types associated with women's and men's activities.

Women's Artifacts	Number	%
Thimbles	12	1.5%
Scissors	12	1.5%
Straight Pins	482	59.2%
Beads	185	22.7%
Decorative Fossil Shells	97	11.9%
Toys	26	3.2%
Women's Total	814	100.0%
		62.9% of total
Men's Artifacts	Number	%
Shot and Sprue	68	14.2%
Gunflints and Flint Flakes	287	59.8%
Gun Parts	5	1.0%
Construction Tools	63	13.1%
Fishing Tackle	13	2.7%
Stable and Barn Equipment	44	9.2%
Men's Total	480	100.0%
		37.1% of total
Grand Total	1,294	

Women's and Men's Artifacts

The women's artifacts are associated with the maintenance and production of clothing and body adornment, and the care of children, whereas the men's artifacts are associated with hunting, fishing, building and construction, and livestock. None of the tasks can be considered the exclusive domain of one gender or the other because the jobs performed by women and men necessarily overlapped. For instance, given the potentially imbalanced sex ratio in some places, particularly during the early 18th century, some men may have been relegated to perform domestic tasks normally delegated to women. And in fact under James Bray II the opposite may have been true: a shortage of men may have thrust some women into jobs typically handled by men.

The six artifact types that I associate with Utopia's women consist of thimbles, scissors, straight pins, beads, decorative fossil shells, and toys. Three of the items are used in the process of sewing, mending, darning, and knitting and were more likely to find their way into the hands of women (see Galle 2004). In addition, women were more likely to adorn themselves with decorative beads (or more of them) than men. Archaeologists recovered several hundred fossilized seashells (*Glycymeris*) from features at Utopia, many of which had worm bore holes located at the hinge that allowed them to be strung on necklaces or woven in hair as decoration, and I presume women were the ones adorning themselves in this manner. I also consider toys potentially a woman's domain vis-à-vis their association with childrearing, implying the 25 toy clay marbles and a pewter toy watch are signals of the presence of women.⁵ At times men may have handled "women's" artifacts, but for the most part, women did the majority of sewing and mending, they were more likely to adorn themselves with glass beads and shells, and they were more involved with caring for children who might have played with toys.

I chose six artifact types that I felt could be reasonably considered the province of Utopia's male residents. Included in the group are lead shot and sprue, gunflints and flint flakes, gun parts, construction tools, fishing tackle, and equipment associated with barns and stables. The first three types in the list are involved in the use or maintenance of firearms for hunting, an arena that men were more likely to control than women. In general, men would have had more time to fish in off hours as well. The responsibility for using construction tools for building, maintaining, and repairing equipment mainly

⁵ Clay marbles may have been used by Utopia's adults for other purposes such as entertainment or gambling, or they could serve utilitarian functions such as hem weights for women's dresses or for curtains. However, I am considering marbles associated with children for this analysis.

fell to men. Work involving carting, transportation, and the care of horses and other livestock also was a man's duty more than a woman's. Again, at times women may have found themselves carrying out tasks usually reserved for men and vice versa, but by in large the spheres were prescribed and rarely transgressed.

Like the resource consumption artifacts the gender artifact set consists almost entirely of artifacts that represent individual objects. There are 12 thimbles in the assemblage, not a dozen thimble fragments. Flint flakes and lead sprue are the exceptions. Both are waste products generated during the process of making or retouching gunflints or melting and molding lead shot. None of the 12 categories of artifacts are prone to shattering or breaking into multiple fragments. Documents prove that both women and men were present throughout the entire history of Utopia, rendering the comparison of the gender artifact set between the four occupation periods unnecessary. Women and men may have been segregated during one or more of the occupation periods, however. By comparing how the women's and men's artifacts are arrayed in the housing units, it may be possible to isolate locations of gendered activity, and thereby providing vital information about the composition of households and coresidential groups at Utopia.

Gender among the Ten Housing Units

The Women's Artifact Set

For the 814 artifacts associated with women, straight pins were by far the most abundant women's artifact type ($n=482$), making up 59.2 percent of the assemblage (Figure 8.6). Beads ($n=185$) at 22.7 percent, and decorative fossil shells ($n=97$) at 11.9 percent were a far-off second and third. The other three women's artifact types all

registered at less than five percent, with toys ($n=26$) at 3.2 percent, and thimbles ($n=12$), and scissors ($n=12$) both at 1.5 percent. Together straight pins and beads comprised 82 percent of the women's artifacts, far outnumbering the other four artifact types (see Figure 8.6).

The two Period 3 housing units generated more than half the women's artifacts (Figure 8.7; Table 8.10). Structure 50 produced the highest percentage of women's artifacts ($n=31.4$ percent), largely due to the 216 straight pins in its assemblage. Structure 40 generated 23 percent of the women's artifacts, again due to an abundance of straight pins ($n=113$). Structures 1 and 10 were the only other housing units to contain more than ten percent of the women's artifacts, Structure 1 at 17.4 percent (mostly from 109 glass beads) and Structure 10 at 12 percent (see Figure 8.7). Based on the percentages, these four housing units yielded 83.8 percent of the women's artifacts, dwarfing the six remaining units (see Table 8.10).

The Men's Artifact Set

Gunflints and flint flakes ($n=287$) dominated the men's assemblage at 59.8%, with shot and sprue ($n=68$) running a distant second at 14.2 percent, and construction tools ($n=63$) at 13.1 percent (Figure 8.8). Stable and barn equipment ($n=44$) at 9.2 percent, fishing tackle ($n=13$) at 2.7 percent, and gun parts ($n=5$) at 1.0 percent rounded out the men's assemblage. Added together, the stable and barn equipment, fishing tackle, and gun parts did not equal the number of construction tools, the third ranking artifact type in the men's group, and all five types pooled together did not equal gunflints and flakes (see Figure 8.8).

Table 8.10. Distribution of women's artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units.

	Thimbles	Scissors	Straight Pins	Beads	Decorative Shells	Toys	Total
Cottage	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.4%)	16 (2.0%)	4 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	23 (2.8%)
Structure 1	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	31 (3.8%)	109 (13.4%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	142 (17.4%)
Structure 10	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	57 (7.0%)	16 (2.0%)	22 (2.7%)	2 (0.2%)	98 (12.0%)
Structure 20	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	30 (3.7%)	11 (1.4%)	7 (0.9%)	2 (0.2%)	51 (6.3%)
Structure 40	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	113 (13.9%)	6 (0.7%)	60 (7.4%)	6 (0.7%)	187 (23.0%)
Structure 50	4 (0.5%)	1 (0.1%)	216 (26.5%)	30 (3.7%)	4 (0.5%)	1 (0.1%)	256 (31.4%)
Duplex 140-1	1 (0.1%)	3 (0.4%)	14 (1.7%)	6 (0.7%)	2 (0.2%)	11 (1.4%)	37 (4.5%)
Duplex 140-2	4 (0.5%)	3 (0.4%)	3 (0.4%)	3 (0.4%)	1 (0.1%)	4 (0.5%)	18 (2.2%)
Structure 150	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.00%)
Structure 160	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)
Total	12	12	482	185	97	26	814 (100%)

Structure 50 yielded the highest amount of men's artifacts at 22.5 percent, followed by Structure 10 at 19.4 percent, and Structure 1 at 17.9 percent (Figure 8.9; Table 8.11). These three housing units generated nearly 60 percent of the men's assemblage. Duplex 1 and Structure 40 contained compatible percentages of material at 11.7 percent and 10.2 percent respectively, to form a mid-level group, and Structure 20 (n=6.3 percent), Duplex 2 (n=6.3 percent), and the Utopia Cottage (n=5.6) formed a lower tier. Structure 160 barely registered, and Structure 150 failed to register at all (see Figure 8.9).

Comparing the Ratios of Men's and Women's Artifacts in the Housing Units

The objective is to compare the ratio of women's and men's artifacts in each housing unit. However, the sample sizes for some of the artifact types such as straight pins, beads, and gunflints and flakes overshadow the other types causing any comparisons to become heavily weighted by them. The skewing caused by extreme sample-size differences can be eliminated by computing the proportions of artifact types within each housing unit in a sequence of stages. First, I calculated the proportions of the 12 artifact types for each housing unit (Table 8.12).⁶ Next, I divided the resulting proportion for each artifact type in each housing unit by the sum of the proportions of its artifact type to generate proportions that are not biased by sample-size discrepancies (Table 8.13). For example, the proportion of straight pins in Structure 1 (n=13.6 percent) is divided by the total proportion of straight pins in the entire dataset (n=241 percent) to arrive at a weighted proportion of straight pins in Structure 1 at 5.64 percent (see Tables

⁶ Because of a lack of data, Structures 150 and 160 were not included in any further comparisons.

Table 8.12. Proportion of artifact types within eight housing units at Utopia.

Table 8.11. Distribution of men's artifacts among Utopia's ten housing units.

	Shot and Sprue	Gunflints and Flakes	Gun Parts	Construction Tools	Fishing Tackle	Stable/ Barn Equipment	Total
Cottage	4 (0.8 %)	12 (2.5%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.5%)	27 (5.6%)
Structure 1	13 (2.7%)	71 (14.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	86 (17.9%)
Structure 10	17 (3.5%)	63 (13.1%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (1.3%)	1 (0.2%)	6 (1.3%)	93 (19.4%)
Structure 20	5 (1.0%)	18 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	30 (6.3%)
Structure 40	7 (1.5%)	19 (4.0%)	1 (0.2%)	11 (2.3%)	5 (1.0%)	6 (1.3%)	49 (10.2%)
Structure 50	17 (3.5%)	73 (15.2%)	2 (0.4%)	6 (1.3%)	2 (0.4%)	8 (1.7%)	108 (22.5%)
Duplex 140-1	3 (0.6%)	18 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	22 (4.6%)	3 (0.6%)	10 (2.1%)	56 (11.7%)
Duplex 140-2	2 (0.4%)	13 (2.7%)	1 (0.2%)	9 (1.9%)	2 (0.4%)	3 (0.6%)	30 (6.3%)
Structure 150	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Structure 160	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)
Total	68	287	5	63	13	44	480 (100%)

Table 8.12. Proportion of artifact types within eight housing units at Utopia.

	Cottage	Str 1	Str 10	Str 20	Str 40	Str 50	Dplex 1	Dplex 2	Total
Thimbles	0.00%	0.00%	0.52%	1.23%	0.42%	1.10%	1.08%	8.33%	12.69%
Scissors	6.00%	0.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	0.27%	3.23%	6.25%	16.61%
Straight Pins	32.00%	13.60%	29.84%	37.04%	47.88%	59.34%	15.05%	6.25%	241.00%
Beads	8.00%	47.81%	8.38%	13.58%	2.54%	8.24%	6.45%	6.25%	101.25%
Decorative Fossil Shells	0.00%	0.44%	11.52%	8.64%	25.42%	1.10%	2.15%	2.08%	51.36%
Toys	0.00%	0.00%	1.05%	2.47%	2.54%	0.27%	11.83%	8.33%	26.49%
Shot and Sprue	8.00%	5.70%	8.90%	6.17%	2.97%	4.67%	3.23%	4.17%	43.80%
Gunflints/Flint Flakes	24.00%	31.14%	32.98%	22.22%	8.05%	20.05%	19.35%	27.08%	184.89%
Gun Parts	2.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	0.55%	0.00%	2.08%	5.06%
Construction Tools	6.00%	0.00%	3.14%	6.17%	4.66%	1.65%	23.66%	18.75%	64.03%
Fishing Tackle	0.00%	0.00%	0.52%	0.00%	2.12%	0.55%	3.23%	4.17%	10.58%
Stable/Barn Equipment	14.00%	0.88%	3.14%	2.47%	2.54%	2.20%	10.75%	6.25%	42.23%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	800.00%

Table 8.13. Weighted proportions of artifact types within eight housing units at Utopia.

	Cottage	Str 1	Str 10	Str 20	Str 40	Str 50	Dplex 1	Dplex 2	Total
Thimbles	0.00%	0.00%	4.13%	9.73%	3.34%	8.66%	8.47%	65.67%	100.0%
Scissors	36.12%	2.64%	0.00%	0.00%	2.55%	1.65%	19.42%	37.62%	100.0%
Straight Pins	13.28%	5.64%	12.38%	15.37%	19.87%	24.62%	6.25%	2.59%	100.0%
Beads	7.90%	47.22%	8.27%	13.41%	2.51%	8.14%	6.37%	6.17%	100.0%
Decorative Fossil Shells	0.00%	0.85%	22.43%	16.83%	49.51%	2.14%	4.19%	4.06%	100.0%
Toys	0.00%	0.00%	3.95%	9.32%	9.60%	1.04%	44.64%	31.45%	100.0%
Shot and Sprue	18.26%	13.02%	20.32%	14.09%	6.77%	10.66%	7.36%	9.51%	100.0%
Gunflints/Flint Flakes	12.98%	16.84%	17.84%	12.02%	4.35%	10.85%	10.47%	14.65%	100.0%
Gun Parts	39.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.38%	10.87%	0.00%	41.20%	100.0%
Construction Tools	9.37%	0.00%	4.91%	9.64%	7.28%	2.57%	36.95%	29.28%	100.0%
Fishing Tackle	0.00%	0.00%	4.95%	0.00%	20.02%	5.19%	30.48%	39.37%	100.0%
Stable/Barn Equipment	33.15%	2.08%	7.44%	5.85%	6.02%	5.20%	25.46%	14.80%	100.0%

8.12 and 8.13). Adding together the weighted proportions for women's artifacts and men's artifacts in Table 8.13 for each housing unit provides a ratio of the two groups (Table 8.14). The difference between the women's and men's groups can be charted to illustrate those housing units where one gender exerted a larger degree of influence over another (Figure 8.10).

Table 8.14. Weighted proportions of women's and men's artifacts within eight housing units at Utopia.

	Women's Artifacts	Men's Artifacts	Difference	Advantage
Utopia Cottage	57.30%	113.32%	-56.02%	Men
Structure 1	56.35%	31.94%	+24.42%	Women
Structure 10	51.16%	55.45%	-4.29%	
Structure 20	64.66%	41.60%	+23.06%	Women
Structure 40	87.37%	52.82%	+34.55%	Women
Structure 50	46.25%	45.34%	+0.91%	
Duplex 140-1	89.34%	110.72%	-21.38%	Men
Duplex 140-2	147.57%	148.81%	-1.24%	

Figure 8.10 illustrates the differences, with bars with positive values for Structures 1, 20, 40, and 50 favoring women's artifacts, and bars with negative values for the Utopia Cottage, Structure 10, Duplex 1 and 2 indicating units favoring men's artifacts. The dashed lines indicate the average difference per housing unit between the women's and men's artifacts ($n=20.7$ percent). Structures 1, 20, and 40 extend beyond the average considerably, and suggest the strong presence of women in those housing units. On the men's side, the Utopia Cottage and Duplex 1 reach past the 20.7 percent average, implying that those units were centers of men's activity (see Figure 8.10). The differences between the gendered artifacts in Structures 10 and 50, and in Duplex 2 were negligible, suggesting that both men and women were active inside the three housing units.

Based on the distribution of gendered artifacts, women's activity appears to have had a more intensive presence in Structures 1, 20, and 40, perhaps to the exclusion of men. Likewise, men maintained high visibility in the Cottage and Duplex 1 and their activities exceeded those of women (see Figure 8.10). In none of the housing units was there a complete absence of either women's or men's artifacts, nor was this to be expected. Instead, the gender patterns suggest that at some point these particular units may have housed a single sex. It is interesting to note that Structures 10 and 50, the two housing units that likely functioned as barracks, have an almost even distribution of women's and men's artifacts, whereas several of the units that presumably contained households (Structures 20 and 40) are weighted to women or to men (Duplex 1). Essentially, this seems to suggest that the hypothesis that the membership of coresidences might be comprised of a single sex does not appear to hold for Utopia.

Resource Consumption and Gender Patterns and the Slave Family at Utopia

Delving into the archaeological record of resource consumption and gender patterns at Utopia has helped to confirm or reiterate some of the findings made in the previous chapters, and added some new wrinkles to the story of household development and change at the site. Resource consumption analysis is based on a simple premise: families living in households helped one another, shared resources, and cooperated for the betterment of the group, whereas on the opposite extreme, individuals in a coresident group were less likely to do these things, or not at all. The end result is that members of coresidences were not as capable, as well organized, or efficient at generating resources, while households pooled resources and labor. In terms of gender, housing units with

evidence of one dominant gender, either men or women, were likely to have functioned at some point as coresidencies, whereas those units with both genders in residence would be in a better position to achieve household status.

It must be cautioned that residency patterns changed frequently at places like Utopia and people must have cycled in and out of the housing units at a fairly regular rate. One month a household, the next a coresidence, and it would be naïve to believe that the same group was able to reside together in one housing unit for an extended period of time. By virtue of this, in most of the housing units, perhaps all, both coresident groups and households contributed to the archaeological record. It is possible that over time each cancelled the other out, producing consumption and gender patterns that are jumbled together. I am relying, however, on the contention that some housing units experienced enough of one type of residency group to establish a consistent pattern. The patterns may be indistinct, but an examination of the resource consumption and gender patterns together can underscore those housing units with a household profile, and those with a coresidence profile.

As the only housing unit for Period 1, the Utopia Cottage can not be compared and contrasted with a contemporaneous unit, making it difficult to place into perspective. The Cottage's levels of resource consumption appear to be on the low end of the scale (see Figures 8.3 and 8.4), and it produced only 0.028 artifacts per cubic foot of soil, the lowest percentage of all the housing units at Utopia except for Structure 150 which generated no consumer goods at all (see Figure 8.5). In terms of gender, the Cottage produced a significant number of men's artifacts in excess of women's, by far the highest ratio between the gendered artifact groups (see Figure 8.10). The difference between the

two was enough to flag the housing unit as a possible coresidence occupied mostly by men. Given these findings, it is fair to say that the artifact patterns point to its use primarily as a coresidence.

Resource consumption patterns for Period 2 suggest that Structures 20 served as a household, with Structure 1 as a coresidence, and Structure 10 somewhere between them (see Figure 8.5). The gender data indicates elevated activity by women in Structures 1 and 20, and Structure 10 with no significant differences between women's and men's artifacts, seemingly indicative of a household (see Figure 8.10). And yet, Structure 10 fits the profile for a coresident barracks based on its size and pattern of sub-floor pits (see Figure 6.4). How does one reconcile a household consumption pattern that is contradicted by its substantial size and multiple pits which both suggest its use as a coresidential barracks? In fact, of all the housing units at Utopia Structure 10 presents the most obvious appearance of a segregated coresidence with multiple people bunking in the parlor, and an active hearth in the hall (see Figure 6.4). And therein may be the answer: during its lifetime Structure 10 may have been divided into a duplex of sorts, with solitaires coresiding together in the parlor, and a group of people functioning as a household occupying the hall (see Fesler 2004). Overall, the consumption patterns and gender profiles for Period 2 suggest that a coresident group of women occupied Structure 1, Structure 10 functioned as a quasi-duplex perhaps, and Structure 20 might have been home to a household of women.

For Period 3, Structure 40 consistently ranks as the housing unit with the highest degree of resource consumption at Utopia, suggestive of a household (see Figures 8.3 - 8.5). Structure 40 also produced the highest levels of women's artifacts at Utopia,

making its gender profile distinctly tilted to female activity, which would imply a coresident group of women (see Figure 8.10). The consumption pattern contradicts the gender pattern. Perhaps Structure 40 functioned as a household headed by a woman (or women) with no husband or male figure in regular attendance. Given the frequency of abroad marriages by the mid-18th century, this would explain Structure 40's high consumption readings and the abundance of women's artifacts in comparison to men's.

Compared to Structure 40, Structure 50's rate of resource consumption is much lower, and its gender profile is neutral (see Figures 8.5 and 8.10). My interpretation of these trends is that Structure 50 indeed functioned as a coresident barracks, occupied by both sexes. The sizes and sub-floor pitting patterns of both Period 3 housing units corroborate the consumption and gender profiles: Structure 50 operated as a coresidential barracks, and Structure 40 as a household, perhaps headed by a woman.

Among all ten housing units Duplexes 1 and 2 both ranked high on the charts for resource consumption (see Figures 8.3 and 8.4). Comparisons between the two show a decided advantage to Duplex 1, suggesting it was a better organized and more efficient unit of consumption (see Figure 8.5). The gender profile of Duplex 1 indicates a dominant presence of men's activities, whereas Duplex 2 is neutral (see Figure 8.10). I maintain that these patterns indicate that both duplexes functioned as households, but that Duplex 1 was occupied by an individual or group that had a greater capacity for resource consumption. By the third quarter of the 18th century slaves throughout the Chesapeake had established social hierarchies that allowed some to have greater access to resources. It is quite possible that Duplex 1 housed a skilled craftsman or authority figure, and this elevated status is reflected in the archaeological record. Structure 150 failed to produce

any resource consumption or gendered artifacts, and Structure 160 such a small amount, that no relevant comparisons with other housing units could be made.

Figure 8.1. Hypothetical effects of the transition from coresident groups to households.

Figure 8.2. Rates of consumption of selected goods per occupation period.

Figure 8.3. Rates of resource consumption per housing unit, by percentage.

Figure 8.4. Rates of resource consumption per housing unit, by rank.

Figure 8.5. Ratio of resource consumption goods per feature volume.

Figure 8.7. Percentages of women's artifacts from Utopia's ten housing units.

Figure 8.6. Percentages of women's artifacts by type.

Women's Artifacts

Figure 8.7. Percentages of women's artifacts from Utopia's ten housing units.

Men's Artifacts

Figure 8.8. Percentages of men's artifacts by type.

Men's Artifacts

Figure 8.9. Percentages of men's artifacts from Utopia's ten housing units.

Figure 8.10. Differences between men's and women's artifacts in eight of Utopia's housing units.

CHAPTER IX.

RETROSPECTION AND CONCLUSIONS: THE SLAVE FAMILY AT UTOPIA

Listen for the tragedy *and* the transcendence in slave cultures.

David W. Blight (1995:9)

I have attempted to build a case that demonstrates the growth of households and families at the Utopia Quarter. The case is not ironclad, but based on all the lines of evidence—the historical background, the architectural data, the sub-floor pitting patterns, and the resource consumption and gender profiles—I believe the conditions for families improved over time at the Utopia Quarter. Progress was incremental and gradual, but in the final assessment something resembling family life was attainable for more of Utopia's slaves during the final occupation (ca. 1750 to ca. 1775) compared to the beginning of the 18th century. This trend did not occur in isolation at Utopia. Across the Chesapeake coresident living situations were more prevalent in the early 18th century and faded with time. The classic coresidence was made up of solitaires, unallied individuals occupying a barracks, potentially in competition for limited resources. A gradual transformation took place until households supplanted coresidencies as the dominant residential form by the end of the century, in part because some resources became more available with time, in part because slaves recognized the benefits of living with family, and partly because slave owners reaped benefits as well (see Kulikoff 1986:352-380; Morgan 1998:498-558).

In the continuum from coresidence to household, various transitional residence patterns emerged. A fully formed household can be defined more specifically as a simple family household, almost always comprised of consanguineous or conjugal members. In the course of reaching full household status, some may have gone through an

intermediary multifamily household stage where two or more subgroups (a married couple, a single parent, small simple families, etc.) inhabited the same housing unit, but did not fully join forces for survival. Less efficient and productive than a simple family household, a multifamily household possessed characteristics of a full-fledged household, but also had traits of a coresidence.

I have chosen the narrative form to present the historical archaeological story of the households and families at the Utopia Quarter. I will address each of the site's occupation periods by integrating the documentary, architectural, archaeological, and artifactual data pertaining to each (Table 9.1). After presenting a summation of household and family development for each occupation period at Utopia, I consider the larger ramifications the work at Utopia may have for the study of households in general, and I suggest areas of further research that may widen the scope of archaeological studies of household development at slave quarters.

Table 9.1. A synopsis of residency patterns as determined by architecture, sub-floor pits, and consumption/gender patterns.

	Architecture	Sub-Floor Pits	Consumption/ Gender Patterns
PERIOD 1			
Utopia Cottage	Multifamily	-	Coresidence
PERIOD 2			
Structure 1	Coresidence	Household	Coresidence
Structure 10	Coresidence	Coresidence	Coresidence/Household
Structure 20	Coresidence	Household	Household
PERIOD 3			
Structure 40	Household	Household	Household
Structure 50	Coresidence	Coresidence	Coresidence
PERIOD 4			
Duplex 140-1	Household	Household	Household
Duplex 140-2	Household	Household	Household
Structure 150	-	Household	-
Structure 160	-	Household	-

Period 1 (ca. 1675 – 1700)

The initial occupation of Utopia is the most difficult to decipher in terms of residency patterns. Both the historical and archaeological records present their own unique challenges for interpretation, and Period 1's architecture and artifact patterns are the least comparable of the four occupation periods. We know that Thomas Pettus II built a quarter at Utopia in the 1670s. A combination of Pettus's English indentured servants and enslaved Africans inhabited the site until his death in 1690. At that time Pettus owned at least five African slaves and one English indentured boy, according to an inventory of his estate (see Appendix A). However, it is likely that he owned two or three times that number of workers. The 1691 inventory may be incomplete because evidence suggests that his widow's new husband James Bray II absconded with a large portion of his workforce before they could be inventoried (see Appendix A). The five slaves that did make the list consisted of two middle-aged men, two middle-aged women, and a 12-year-old boy (see Table 4.1), leading me to surmise that the adults may have formed two couples and the boy was the son of one of them. Whether these particular slaves lived at Utopia cannot be ascertained.

Of the ten housing units built at Utopia, the most materials, time, and care was expended on the Cottage, and it was outfitted with the most amenities (see Figure 6.1). With nearly 700 square feet of floor space, two large fireplaces, a wood floor set on top of a half cellar, life in the Cottage reached a grand scale compared to the housing units that were to come later in the 18th century. On the face of it, servants and slaves could have occupied the Cottage by separating into each half of the housing unit, one group in the hall, one in the parlor, similar to a duplex. Or, given the social precepts of the era,

servant and slave may have freely intermixed within the living space. My suspicion is that the Cottage originally was intended to house servants in one room, and an overseer in the other, thus explaining the unusual occurrence of fireplaces on each gable end. Weighing all the architectural evidence, I believe in practice the Utopia Cottage primarily housed multifamily units; although based on the architectural hypothesis regarding size it fits the profile of a coresidence. What is clear here is that the Cottage presents a problem of comparison with the later Utopia housing units.

Approached by a stranger, the Cottage had every appearance of a home owned by a middling farmer, perhaps a well-off gentleman, not an abode for mere field laborers. The Cottage was built before the escalation of slavery, expressly for Pettus's English indentured servants, and that would seem to be the reason why some amount of attention was lavished on its construction. Chesapeake society was stratified in the 1670s to be sure, but by class, not race. And even the most debased indentured servant was not considered subhuman, as enslaved Africans would be categorized by their owners in the coming decades. Pettus could not have anticipated in the 1670s that within a decade the complexion of his workforce would change so dramatically. Had the housing unit been intended for African slaves from the outset it probably would have been built for far less expense. Therefore, the Utopia Cottage was not constructed as a slave quarter *per se*, making it difficult to compare with the later slave quarters at the site. As an architectural entity, the Utopia Cottage is an apple to the later periods' oranges.

The cast of characters that potentially contributed to Period 1's archaeological record spans from servants and slaves, to overseers and perhaps even tenants. After Pettus's death in 1690, it is unclear who, if anyone occupied the site in the decade that

followed. If the Cottage continued to be used, tenants are the most likely candidates, potentially adding ancillary material to the archaeological record until the building was destroyed by fire at some point. Thus, if my reasoning is correct, the artifact assemblage from Period 1 is a mixture of three, and maybe four different social groups, making it difficult to judge against the assemblages from the latter three occupation periods which were generated by slaves alone. With these concerns in mind, the level of resource consumption at the Utopia Cottage does not rate high on the scale compared to some of the later housing units, suggesting a poor degree of organization and economic efficiency (see Figures 8.3 - 8.5). And the Cottage produced the highest ratio of men's to women's artifacts, indicating a deficiency of women during Period 1 (see Figure 8.10). Both these lines of evidence imply that coresidence was the prevailing form of organization in the Cottage. However, once again we may have an apples to oranges problem, and my interpretation is tempered by this. Overall, Period 1 presents the appearance of coresident living, but the inability to place those findings into proper comparison with Periods 2, 3, and 4 leaves those conclusions largely speculative.

Period 2 (1700 – ca. 1730)

In 1700 James Bray II acquired the Utopia property, and by 1710 he had revived activity at the site by building a compound of housing units there. Based on an inventory of Bray's estate in 1726, the number of women and men living at Littletown/Utopia was virtually equal (see Table 4.4). Bray entailed his land and slaves, lending some degree of protection from an extensive sell-off of slaves, and the demography of his slave population had the characteristics of stability—gender ratio at par, the presence of children, and a large enough number of people in residence at Littletown/Utopia to allow

for social interaction and security. From the documentary records it would appear that life at Utopia under James Bray II was relatively favorable for the formation of households and families, particularly given its early 18th-century context.

Considering the size of the three Period 2 housing units, Structures 1 and 20 at 336 square feet, and Structure 10 at 563 square feet, all were capable of accommodating a large group of people (see Figure 5.14). Among the three housing units, Structure 10 provided 40 percent more interior space than the other two buildings. That difference alone suggests that it was the most likely candidate for use as a coresidence. The average size of a slave quarter for the period (1700 – 1720) was 426 square feet (not counting the three quarters here), meaning that Structures 1 and 20 were below the average by nearly 25 percent. Perhaps for their time Structures 1 and 20 were considered diminutive, equivalent to a 200 square foot family cabin a century later. Yet, based strictly on size, all three Period 2 housing units could have served as proverbial barracks and held coresidential groups of a dozen people or more (see Table 9.1).

The sub-floor pitting patterns for Period 2 strongly indicate that a coresidential group occupied Structure 10, while Structures 1 and 20 produced pit profiles that corresponded to household use. Structure 10 contained 12 sub-floor pits, Structure 1 half that number at six sub-floor pits, and Structure 20 had a single large hearth-front pit (see Figure 5.14). Of all the housing units at Utopia, the array of pits in Structure 10, particularly the segregation of eight personal storage pits in the parlor, presents what could be considered a prototypical coresident pattern (see Figure 6.4). Juxtapose its size advantage over the other two smaller housing units, and the case for Structure 10 as a barracks is made even more convincing.

In terms of artifact patterns, Structure 20 has the earmarks of a household of women (see Figures 8.5 and 8.10). On the other end of the spectrum, Structure 1 appears to have served as a coresidence for a group of women (see Figures 8.5 and 8.10). Structure 10 ranks between the two in resource consumption, and exhibits a neutral gender profile, making it difficult to identify as a household or coresident group (see Figures 8.5 and 8.10); a persuasive case could be made for either. However, its large size and complex sub-floor pit profile seem to tip the scales toward its function as a coresidence. To make sense of this conflicting evidence I suggest that Structure 10 may have been internally divided. In the parlor a group of unrelated persons, probably men, appears to have coresided together, whereas the hall contained a working household, perhaps a simple family with a strong female presence (see Fesler 2004). I contend that men would have been more inclined than women to use sub-floor pits for personal storage. With women spending the bulk of their non-fieldwork time at the quarter tending to domestic chores, it was less crucial for a woman to store her belongings out of sight in a defined space compared to a man who supposedly spent more of his off-hours away from the quarter roving about the countryside. If I am correct that Structure 10 was divided into a male coresident parlor and a household in the hall, this would account for Structure 10's relatively elevated level of resource consumption and its neutral gender data that are at odds with its large size and multiple sub-floor pits.

In general, all three housing units in Period 2 have more coresidential traits than household traits (see Table 9.1). And yet it would be implausible to believe that all three units functioned as coresidences for the entirety of Period 2. Because of its early 18th-century date of occupation, and the manner in which the housing units formed an

enclosed compound analogous to West and Central African family compounds, we would do well to consider the three housing units as a "meta-housing unit" of sorts (see Goody 1972). The residency patterns within the compound may not conform to households or coresident groups in the traditional sense (see Fesler 2004). Instead, the compound could have functioned like a single housing unit, with the structures acting as detached "rooms," perhaps segregated by gender, age, skill, or some other cultural tenet, and the yard in the center of the compound as the central loci for social activity (see Pulsipher and Wells-Bowie 1989; Armstrong 1990; Hall 1990:170; Chapman 1991; Westmacott 1992; Gundaker 1993, 1998; Heath and Bennett 2000). The housing units, therefore, may have served as separate parts of a whole residency unit, rather than three independent living units.

If we consider the social structure of Period 2 as resembling a highly sophisticated, communal village this could explain the paradoxical nature of Structure 10, and to a lesser extent Structures 1 and 20. Membership in this meta-housing unit was not contingent on where each member slept at night. Instead, sleeping arrangements may have served a symbolic purpose to establish a hierarchy, but individuals were not obligated to create liaisons with their bunkmates (see Fesler 2004). For example, the high levels of women's artifacts could indicate that women slept and ate in Structures 1 and 20, leaving evidence of female social spheres there, but some of them may have had alliances with a husband or mate living in another housing unit in the compound or elsewhere. Structure 10 could have housed the men, some of whom carved out private storage spaces in the parlor floor. And as mentioned earlier, Structure 10 may have been separated between the hall and parlor, with different types of groups occupying each

room. On the whole, the Period 2 compound seems to defy categorization by residency type, and we may need to develop a new set of terms to capture its unique character.

Period 3 (ca. 1730 – ca. 1750)

By 1728 Thomas Bray II acquired temporary control of Utopia, and passed it along to his son James Bray III in 1736. At some point in the 1730s, either at the behest of Thomas or James, new quarters were built at Utopia, initiating a third discrete period of occupation. When James III died in 1744, his widow received as her dower share the Utopia property and 29 slaves, many of the group probably living and working at the Utopia Quarter (see Table 4.5). The list of dower slaves contained an almost equal number of women and men, and children made up a healthy proportion of the group (41 percent). Although the demographic profile suggests that many of the 29 slaves could have been living in family groups at the time, the economic fortunes of Thomas II and James Bray III set off a period of volatile residency shifts. Between 1732 and 1738 at least 44 new slaves were integrated into the existing Bray slave population, certainly a cause for social friction. Thus, although the demographic factors were in place for family growth at Utopia, individual residential groups potentially experienced more moments of discord than harmony.

Period 3 denotes the first occasion at Utopia that housing units specially were built for smaller groups, ostensibly for families. Erected in the early 1730s, Structures 40 and 50 were identical in size at 12' by 16'. At a later point in time Structure 50 was expanded to twice its size (cf. Figures 6.7 and 6.8). In this manner Structure 50 was converted from a housing unit intended for a family group to a barracks for group

lodging. This is the most direct evidence at Utopia of a change in the material record that directly corresponds to a documented event, the introduction of several dozen new slaves into the Bray slave population, the result of Thomas Bray II's permission to dock the entail on some of his properties in order to buy more slaves (Winfree 1971:381-384). In terms of the sizes of housing units, Structure 40 has the attributes of a household, and Structure 50 as a coresidence.

The marked differences in sub-floor pit patterns in Structures 40 and 50 reinforces the architectural data: the limited number of sub-floor pits in Structure 40 clearly identifies its use as a household of people sharing storage spaces, whereas the plenitude of pits in Structure 50 signals coresidency (cf. Figures 6.7 and 6.8). In fact, Structure 50 contained a majority of non-hearth-front pits, the kind of pits most often used for personal storage, and an unmistakable sign of group lodging (see Figure 6.8). The Period 3 pitting profiles reveal a stark contrast between the two housing units.

The contrast also is present when comparing resource consumption behavior and gender patterns. Structure 40 ranked highest for resource consumption artifacts at Utopia, and generated a vastly higher percentage of them than Structure 50 (see Figure 8.5 and Table 8.7). Structure 40 also yielded the highest degree of difference for women's artifacts over men's, whereas gender artifacts were split down the middle for Structure 50 (see Figure 8.10). Combined, the patterns suggest a woman-headed (perhaps woman-dominated) household in Structure 40, and a coresident group of women and men in Structure 50.

Across-the-board, the architectural, sub-floor pit, and artifact patterns for Period 3 consistently establish that Structure 40 functioned as a household, and Structure 50 as a

coresidence (see Table 9.1). The different functions demonstrate that Thomas II and James III maintained different housing strategies for assimilated creole slaves and the stream of new Africans they regularly added to the population. Structure 40 represents the prerogatives of the creoles and is an early precursor to housing units that were to become the norm a generation later. Structure 50 started out the same way, intended for a smaller family group, but was transformed into a barracks, a throwback to the previous generation and signifies a stage in the assimilation process. Structures 40 and 50 were two different worlds separated by fewer than 100 feet, and most of the residents of the barracks at Structure 50 probably realized that it was to their advantage to make the leap to Structure 40 as quickly as possible, or continue to live in a crowded, uncomfortable, less beneficial environment.

Period 4 (ca. 1750 – ca. 1775)

By marrying Frances Bray in 1745, Lewis Burwell IV was able to get hold of Utopia and 29 slaves attached to it, and held the property for the next 30 years. By the early 1750s Utopia took on its final incarnation with the construction of a large duplex and eventually two smaller structures (see Figure 5.32). The available documentary evidence suggests that for roughly two decades, from 1745 to 1765, the conditions for family growth were the most favorable in Utopia's 100-year life span. New Africans had become a rare sight, the sex ratio was nearly even, and the slave population was on the rise, all trends that boosted family growth and stabilized residency patterns. However, for Utopia's slaves many of these potential gains were reversed in the decade leading up to 1775 as Lewis IV prepared to pull up stakes and moved west to Mecklenburg County. Many of the slave families and households that may have been relatively secure in 1760

gradually were dismantled by sale or transfer, a frightful reminder that the tenuous stability of a slave family could be shattered in an instant.

Although Structure 140 formed the largest building at Utopia at 704 square feet, all the evidence points to its use as a duplex, divided into two separate housing units at approximately half the size (see Figure 6.10). Structures 150 and 160 were added at a later date, their exact dimensions unknown, but neither one seemingly more than 16' square. It would appear that the three buildings stood together until they were abandoned in 1775. If my interpretation of Structure 140 as a duplex is correct, and I have accurately estimated the sizes of Structures 150 and 160, Period 4 represents the only occupation period at Utopia for which all the housing units were intended for smaller, family-sized groups. Both Periods 2 and 3 that preceded it each had a housing unit that was substantially larger than the others and used for coresident group lodging. All four Period 4 housing units were raised off the ground on piers and sported wood floors, a noteworthy improvement over dirt floors for Periods 2 and 3. Thus, it would appear that the Period 4 housing units were a response to the evolving needs of his slaves, and all four of the units functioned as households.

Although Duplexes 1 and 2 were intensively occupied and produced a high volume of sub-floor pits, careful consideration of sequencing indicates that normally no more than a couple of the pits were in use at any one time (see Figure 7.8). The contrast between the multiple pits in the duplexes and single pits inside Structures 150 and 160 could lead one to conclude erroneously that different types of residency groups lived in them. The lack of re-pitting in Structures 150 and 160 probably was a result of a shorter life span for them compared to Structure 140. In fact, recurring pitting in the duplexes

could be interpreted as a sign that they were continuously occupied by family households that had put down roots and preferred to stay put and renovate their homes rather than relocate to a newer cabin. There is no direct evidence of this; nevertheless my interpretation of the sub-floor pits in the four Period 4 housing units is that they fit the pattern that we have come to expect from households and families.

Duplex 1 ranked as one of the highest units of resource consumption at Utopia, whereas Duplex 2 came in fifth (see Figure 8.5). According to the gender profiles, men established a strong presence in Duplex 1, and both women and men were equally represented in Duplex 2 (see Figure 8.10). I propose that the artifact differences may indicate a case of social stratification. A person or group living inside Duplex 1 seems to have been positioned higher on the social food chain than the next-door neighbors in Duplex 2, engendering a measurable difference in the material record. No viable comparisons could be made with the artifact patterns from Structures 150 and 160, but the duplex units fit the profile of households in terms of resource consumption.

Based on housing unit size, sub-floor pits, and artifact patterns, all the characteristics of Period 4 point to mature households probably organized as family groups (see Table 9.1). In the previous occupation period there appears to have been a qualitative difference between a household and a coresidence. The quality of life in Structure 40 simply was better than that in Structure 50. By Period 4 residency no longer defined a person's status at Utopia. Instead, it would appear that varying degrees of economic status were emerging, and one's position on the social ladder was based on other criteria such as job skill, seniority, experience, and the ability to organize and exploit what resources were on hand.

Applications and Implications of the Households at Utopia

This study has been more microscopic than telescopic in approach. My goal was to tease out the archaeological patterns of households and families so as to reveal how they changed over time. Household archaeology emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as a subfield of archaeology intended to capture a more detailed level of understanding about the past, one that moved closer to placing the people who created the archaeological record in the center of interpretation (see Flannery 1976; Wilk and Rathje 1982; Ashmore and Wilk 1988; Allison 1999). The household scale can be considered archaeology writ small, but with ramifications for the bigger picture by producing data and interpretations that link specific sites or housing units with large-scale cultural change. However, the movement toward household analysis has yet to be embraced fully by historical archaeology (see Beaudry 1982, 1989). In fact, the number of household studies conducted by historical archaeologists, particularly those applying data to specific questions regarding household organization, relations, or growth are surprisingly slim (see e.g., Stewart-Abernathy 1986; Beaudry and Mrozowski 1987; Franklin 1997; Wood 2002; Barile and Brandon 2004). Thus, in some respects, one of the goals of this study is to apply anthropological concepts to the housing units at Utopia to illustrate that the internal dynamics of slave households and coresident groups are within our archaeological grasp.

For this study I have taken my cues from anthropology, applying analytical techniques to the study of households at Utopia that derive from archaeological studies conducted in all types of cultural settings around the world, and spanning from the Paleolithic to large-scale societies. Many of the studies are based on ethnoarchaeological

research to establish modern-day examples of domestic site uses and structures that can be applied to past cultures (see e.g., Bourdieu 1971; Hayden and Cannon 1984; Kent 1984; Wilk 1984, 1988; Binford 1987; Kent 1987; O'Connell 1987; Sutro and Downing 1988; Alexander 1999). Essentially, the three frames of analysis I have used at Utopia to interpret the transformation from coresidences to households are changing house size, the changing quantity of interior storage pits, and the differences in relative percentages of certain artifact groups. Each analytical frame is based on an archaeological premise that has been applied many times before. For example, population density and duration play a leading role in determining the size and type of a site (see e.g., Kramer 1979; Rafferty 1994; Schreiber and Kintigh 1996). On a smaller scale, the size of a domestic structure is closely related to the size of the group it can accommodate (see e.g., Wilk 1983; Blanton 1994; Bernardini 2000). The number of storage pits and their functions largely will depend on the size or type of group living at the site (see e.g., LaMotta and Schiffer 1999). And the quantity and types of artifacts generated by a housing unit is indicative of the type of group inhabiting it (see e.g., Seymour and Schiffer 1987). These ideas are not new, but in some ways they are newly applied in historical archaeology at places such as Utopia.

In terms of domestic structures and size, archaeologists (and architectural historians) have devised multiple methods to infer from house plans the types of groups that inhabited them (see e.g., David 1971; Lightfoot and Feinman 1982; Donley-Reid 1990; Lawrence and Low 1990; St. George 1990; Smith and David 1990; Wilk 1990; Neiman 1993; Pearson and Richards 1994; Rafferty 1994; Schillaci and Stojanowski 2002; Creel and Anyon 2003). Often a correlation is made between the size of a structure

or group of structures and its carrying capacity (see Cook and Heizer 1968). Several researchers have attempted to develop frameworks for comparing houses cross-culturally, many of which are based on spatial modeling and theories of proxemics (see Hillier and Hanson 1984; Blanton 1994), or on sets of physical traits that houses share (see Kent 1990). At Utopia I have applied one of the simpler theorems regarding architecture: larger housing units were intended for larger groups of people, and smaller houses for smaller groups. I have made a calculated assumption, supported by historical documentation, that larger groups of enslaved Africans often were comprised of unrelated coresident members, whereas smaller groups normally included people interrelated by blood or marriage. And the evidence at Utopia and the larger Chesapeake suggests a linkage. Hopefully, future studies of slave quarter sites may be able to build upon this thesis, and perhaps find new ones from the growing amount of archaeological literature pertaining to house size and group organization.

The overarching premise for the analysis of sub-floor pits at Utopia is not terribly different from the housing units, and again it is based on a long pedigree of archaeological studies from a variety of cultures through time (see e.g., Binford 1967; Winter 1976; Hayden and Cannon 1983; Hodder 1987; Mobley-Tanaka 1997; Neiman 1997; Lightfoot et al. 1998; Kent 1999; Flannery 2002). Essentially, most of the prior studies conclude that patterning often occurs among pit features and that this indicates functional similarities. Frequently the objective is to establish regularities among a set of pits across several contexts and then explain reasons for this. This type of analysis was attempted for Utopia whereupon differential uses of SFPs could be reasonably determined based on size, depth, shape, and location within a housing unit. For the larger

Chesapeake region, comparison was limited to the number of pits per housing unit.

In both cases, a trend was established: SFPs diminished over the course of the 18th century, and the explanation for this was that as slave families increased, the need for individual SFPs decreased (see Neiman 1997). In the future, it would be useful to continue to assemble a database of SFPs that goes beyond merely counting them.

Diagnostic attributes could be assembled that would allow for more in-depth comparisons, which in turn would introduce new possible interpretations of the uses and meanings of SFPs.

The archaeological literature is rife with sophisticated household archaeological studies of artifact assemblages from various culture areas (see e.g., Deetz 1965; Flannery and Winter 1976; Leventhal and Baxter 1988; Stevenson 1991; Wattenmaker 1994; Diehl 1998; Hagstrum 2001). In most cases, a logical hypothesis is constructed that suggests a reasonable explanation for the meaning of a particular artifact pattern in terms of household change. I constructed an economic model of sorts and applied it to Utopia, suggesting that households were more efficient units of consumption than coresidences. While the findings tentatively suggest that the model worked and was a moderately useful measure of households and coresidences at Utopia, this type of analysis is preliminary. Much work remains to continue to build and improve the model, and if it stands up to scrutiny, to test it in more contexts in a true comparative setting.

A Final Word

This dissertation marks the first case study where several forms of archaeological data have been used to track the changes in Chesapeake slave families. We know that over time, enslaved Africans formed bonds with one another, and eventually

reconstructed families. What is less certain is how slaves were able to do this, at what rate it occurred, what the families came to look like, and how they functioned.

In the archaeological record, I discovered that Utopia's housing units grew smaller with time, as they did in the greater Chesapeake, and that change seems to have correlated with the diminishing size and needs of the slave families expected to live in them. Prompted by research initiated by Fraser Neiman and Patricia Samford, I found that households relied on fewer sub-floor pits than coresident groups, and overall that the average number of pits declined in the Chesapeake over the course of the 18th century. I argue that this occurrence can be attributed to the growth of slave families who were inclined to share storage space instead of competing for it, supporting Neiman's thesis (1997). In my examination of preliminary patterns of resource consumption from artifacts collected from each of Utopia's housing units, I pinpointed the housing units where women or men seem to have congregated, suggesting that those units with the highest levels of resource consumption and a balanced gender ratio were occupied by households.

From the architectural evidence alone, or the sub-floor pits, or the artifacts, it would be difficult to say that a transition from coresidential groups to households and families occurred at Utopia. But together the three lines of evidence allow me to say with considerable confidence that the contours of life did change and the tenor of interpersonal relationships shifted. People tended to coexist and compete in the earlier stages of activity at Utopia, and cohabitate and cooperate in the latter stages, and the archaeological evidence at Utopia bears this out.

APPENDIX A

421

Thomas Pettus's Inventory, 1691

(Henrico County, Miscellaneous Court Records, Vol. I (1650-1717), pp. 73-74)

An Inventory of the Estate of Mr. Thos. Pettus, Deceas'd belonging to his Orphand

Servants

- 1 English Boy named Tho. Taylor about 5 years to serve
- 1 Negro man named Briby aged about 25
- 1 Ditto named Sylliman aged about 50
- 1 Ditto boy named Webb aged about 12
- 1 Ditto Woman named Nan aged about 30
- 1 Ditto named Moll aged about 32

The Plate

- 1 Large Salt
- 2 Candle cups and covers
- 1 Small tankard
- 1 Small porringer
- 1 Sack cup
- 1pr. Broad Snuffers
- 1 Wraugh Sugar dish
- 4 Plates
- 5 New Spoons
- 1 old Spoon with a fork
- 5 old Spoons

Weighing in all sixteen pounds and fourteen ounces

Chattle at Utopia

- 4 Stears
- 8 Cows
- 3 old cows
- 3 yearlings
- 2 Bulls
- 2 two year olds

Chattle at Littletown

- 6 Stears
- 8 Cows
- 2 Bulls
- 2 two yeare olds

62 Sheep

Horses and Mares

6 Mairs of Levevalle Cullers

1 young Coalt

1 two year old horse coult

2 maires, Ditto a colt

-----, broak horse

All the hoggs belonging to the Plantation sould to Mr. James Bray Junr for -----2300

1 Negro man Rec'd from aboard Capt. Jacob Green itt being the produce of Indian Corne sent by Mrs. Bray in the time of her widdowhood and Sould to Will Beck for -----5000

1 Chest of Goods & a cask of nails Rec'ed from aboutd Capt. Norrington Sent by Alderman Jeffreys as p Invoice will appeare -----45:00:0

And as for the household Goods when we went to inventory them; att the time agreed on Mr. James Bray tould us that we came to late for he had Carried them away

[brick Noribed 500 fee, Jus Maul up bill 5 £ Sterling

Did Bossepper 115 £ tob.; Makers Cash allsobut 800£ brofo

Ditto Cash sale of 2200 Pipes Staves Ditto Cash sale of 80 an lbs. tar]

This a true acco't of the Estate of Mr. Tho. Pettus dec'ed in my Custody. There is said money in England not got could to my hand

Nathaniell Bacon

Att a Gen'll Court held at James City [8 Feb] 1691

Nathaniell Bacon [Expresed] and the above Inventory in Court [to move debt]

[Breks] : [Jeff Mcargll] Gen'll Court

[Jamestown]

Recorded in the Secretaries Office

[Jeff Mcargll] Gen'll Co

*Note: Words in parentheses indicate undecipherable text.

APPENDIX B

Deed Releasing Littleton/Utopia to James Bray, 1700 (Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 1938[XLVI(1)]:52-55).

THIS INDENTURE made the fourth day of October in the Twelfth Year of the Reign of our Sovereigne Lord William the Third by the Grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland King Defender of the faith &c; Annog: Domini one thousand seven hundred. Between Allexander Walkers Junr: And Jane his wife and Eliabeth ffreeman of Wilmington parrish in James City County and Stephen Pettus of Blissland parrish in New Kent County on the one part, And James Bray of Willmington parrish in James City County on the other part Witnesseth That the said Allexander Walker Junr. And Jane his Wife Elizabeth ffreeman & Stephen Pettus, ffor & in Consideration of the Sum of five Shillings of Lawfull mony of England to Them in hand payd by the said James Bray the Receipt whereof They doe hereby acknowledge, Hath Bargained and Sold And by these presents doe Bargain & Sell unto the Sd James Bray, all Those Tracts or evidents of Land Commonly called or known by the name or names of Littleton & Utopia Containing by Estimation Twelve hundred & Eighty acres be they more or Less, Lyeing and being on the North side of James River. in Bruton aliis Harrup parrish, in or neer Martins Hundred in James Citty County Bounded vizt Easterly by a small branch of James River called Warehams Run: which devides these Lands ffrom the Land of Mr. William Whitaker, And Westerly by a line of old markt Trees, That begins at an old markt Locus standing uppon the banck of James River near Harrup house, which runs North Easterly cross the head of small Branch into the woods, and devides These bargained premises from the Land Late of Coll Higginson known by the name of Harrup as aforesd. And Southerly by The said Main River, And Northerly into woods cross the Main Road which goes from Middl Plantacon towards the ffrench ordinary, to the Lands of Thomas Buck. & the Land of Harrison or Cumins untill Itt Include the quantity above mentioned,

as alsoe one other Tract of devident of Land Commonly Called the burnt ordinary, Lying & being part in New Kent and part in James Citty County in the parrishes of Willmington and Blissland aforesd. Containing by Estimation ffifteen hundred acres be they more or less bounded vizt. Beginning at a Corner hickery belonging to Capt. Daniell Parks land; Thence down old Rickahock path to a Corner ash on the Southeast Side of the western branch of ware creek. Thence down the said Run & branch North East Twenty Six chains, Thence North East Sixty Six Chains to a Corner ash on the same side of the Run, thence South East by a Line of markt trees one hundred thirty Eight Chains to a Corner Spanish oak by a deep bottome Thence Southwest by a Line of markt trees two hundred & Eight chains to a coner hickery belonging to mr. Borns or Evermans Standing on the East Side of Rickahock Path, Thence down the path Eighteen Chains to a Corner hickery on the West South Side of the Said Path, Thence by a Line of markt trees west Two hundred Twenty ffive Chains west to a Corner Red oak near the dwelling house Late of Goodman Hollidayes, Thence by a Line of markt trees North Eighty Chains to a Corner Hickery belonging to the said Hollidays land, Thence North Wet by West Thirty Three Chains to a Corner poplar Standing in a branch of Warrany Swamp. Thence North East over a branch of the aforesd. Swamp one hundred & Eleaven Chains

to a Corner Red oak thence East North East ffivety Chain to the Corner hickery where it began,

And the Reversion & Reversions Remainder & Remainders, Together with the Rents & proffits of the Premises, and of Every part & parcell thereof. Wth these apurtenances TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the Said Lands Tenements & heredetaments wth these & Every of these members & apurtenances and all and Singular other the premises herein mentioned and intended to be hereby grantd, bargained & sold unto the said James Bray his heires Executors & Assigns from the day before the date hereof ffor and durezza the Term of one whole Year ffrom thence next Ensueing, and fully to be Compleat & Ended Yealding & paying therefore the Yearly Rent of one year of Indian Corn of or upon the first day of January—only if the same be demanded, statute for Transferring uses into possession the said James Bray may be in the actuall possession of The Premises, And be Enabled to accept a grant of the Reversion and Inheritance Thereof to him & his heirs for Ever. In Witness Whereof The partyes above named have hereunto sett There hands & Seals the day & year ffirst above Written.

Signed Sealed and delivered in the presence of us
Edward Travis
Jon J. Coignandanze

At a Court held for James City County the 8th day of October 1700.

Alexander Walker junor. Jane Walker Elizabeth ffreeman & Stephen Pettus came into Court and acknowledged this their Deed unto James Bray Gent and it was admitted to record.

Test C.C. Thacker CL Cur

Alex Walker Junr (Seal)

her

Joan X Walker (Seal)

mark

her

Elizabeth X ffreeman (Seal)

mark

Stephen Pettus (Seal)

(Reverse)

The Within Named Elizabeth ffreeman being now of age and married to Jon J. Coignan Danze, Therefore the Sd Jon Ja Coignan Danze & Elizabeth his Wife Doe hereby Rattifye—Confirm & Establish this present Lease & before the Court now Sitting acknowledge the Same, Soe that all the Land wthin Mention shall pass by the Release & be Confirmd to the Sd James Bray & his heiress for Ever—from all persons whattsoever, wittness boath our hand and Seals the 6th of December 1707.

Jon. Jacob CoigmamDanze.

Eliza: Coignan Danze.

Signed Seald & Delivered in presence of us

Tho. Jones

Cha: Chisseel

At a Court held for James City County the Tweth day of Decembar 1707 John Jacob Coignan Danree & Elizabeth his wife came into Court & sd Eliza being first privately Examined acknowledged the within Lease and endorsement thereone unto James Bray, Which are admitted to Record.

Test Wil Robertson Cl Cu"

Item I Give to my Daughter Elizabeth Allen the Use only of my Land and plantation stock and Negroes that is to say all that are now on and that properly belong to that Plantation called Little Town until my Grandson James Bray comes to the age of Twenty one years or if he dies then until such time as he would have been twenty one had he lived she paying the Quitrents and [land?] and clothing the Negroes with all their increase. I Give my said Grandson at the age of twenty one years to him and the Heirs of his Body Lawfully begotten forever and in default of I Give male in my said Grandson then to my Son Thomas and the Heirs of his Body Lawfully begotten forever. and for default of such to my next Heir forever.

Item I Give my said Daughter Elizabeth all my Land and Plantation called Rockahock on Chickahominy River to her and which of her Children she pleases at the time of her death and their Heirs forever and as for the remaining part of my Estate in the late Wilmington and Bruton Parishes as well real as Personal not hereafter disposed of in this Will. I Give and bequeath the same to my Grandson James Bray and the Heirs Male of his Body lawfully begotten forever and in Default of such I Give to my son Thomas Bray and the Heirs of his Body lawfully begotten forever and for want of such I give to my next Heir forever to be delivered up to my Grandson James Bray as soon as he comes to the age of Twenty one years and until such time to be and remain in the Hands and posselsion of my Son Thomas Bray to be by him Managed towards his own best profit maintainance and support but he is not to make good any that may die.

Item my Will and desire is that my Brick Huse and the Lotts thereto belonging at Williamsburgh be and remain in the Hands of my Executor until the same can be sold by my Son Thomas and the Money arising from such Sale I Give to him and his Heirs forever towards the better maintainance and Education of my Grandson.

Item I Give to Robert Wade all my wearing Cloths now in my Trunk at Little Town.

Item I Give and Bequeath to my Daughter Elizabeth Allen and her Husband all that Estate either Real or Personal formerly delivered by me to them/to them and their Heirs forever. And I likewise do the same to my Daughter Angelica Baker and her Husband.

APPENDIX C

Will of James Bray, November 18, 1725

(James Bray, Will, 1725 November 18, Special Collection Manuscripts, MS 00 1725 Nov 18, Colonial Williamsburg Rockefeller Library)

In the Name of God amen I James Bray of the City of Williamsburg Gent being sick of Body but of sound Mind do make this my Last Will and Testament in manner following First I recommend my Soull to God that gave it and my Body to be decently buried at the discretion of my Executor hereafter named.

Item I Give all that my Estate real and Personal now in the pofsefsion of my son Thomas Bray to him and his Heirs forever.

Item I Give to my Daughter Elizabeth Allen the Use only of my Land and plantation stock and Negroes that is to say all that are now on and that properly belong to that Plantation called Little Town untill my Grandson James Bray comes to the age of Twenty one years or if he dies then untill such time as he would have been twenty one had he lived she paying the Quitrents and [land?] and clothing the Negroes with all their Increase. I Give my said Grandson at the age of twenty one years to him and the Heirs of his Body Lawfully begotten forever and in default of I Give male in my said Grandson then to my Son Thomas and the Heirs of his Body Lawfully begotten forever. and for default of such to my next Heir forever.

Item I Give my said Daughter Elizabeth all my Land and Plantation called Rockahock on Chickahominy River to her and which of her Children she pleases at the time of her death and their Heirs forever and as for the remaining part of my Estate in the late Wilmington and Bruton Parishes as well real as Personal not hereafter disposed of in this Will. I Give and bequeath the same to my Grandson James Bray and the Heirs Male of his Body lawfully begotten forever and in Default of such I Give to my son Thomas Bray and the Heirs of his Body lawfully begotten forever and for want of such I give to my next Heir forever to be delivered up to my Grandson James Bray as soon as he comes to the age of Twenty one years and untill such time to be and remain in the Hands and pofsefsion of my Son Thomas Bray to be by him Managed towards his own best profit maintainance and support but he is not to make good any that may die.

Item my Will and desire is that my Brick Hose and the Lotts thereto belonging at Williamsburgh be and remain in the Hands of my Executor untill the same can be sold by my Son Thomas and the Money arising from such Sale I Give to him and his Heirs forever towards the better maintainance and Education of my Grandson.

Item I Give to Robert Wade all my wearing Cloths now in my Trunk at Little Town.

Item I Give and Bequeath to my Daughter Elizabeth Allen and her Husband all that Estate either Real or Personal formerly delivered by me to them/to them and their Heirs forever. And I likewise do the same to my Daughter Angelica Baker and her Husband.

Item I Give and bequeath to my said Daughter Elizabeth my two single Lotts in the City of Williamsburgh to her and her Heirs forever.

Item It is my Will and desire that after all my Debts and Funeral expenses are fully paid out of my outstanding Debts and what money I have in England that the Remainder of such Debts and money in England be equally divided between my son Thomas and Daughter Elizabeth to them and their Heirs forever and then that my son take pofsefsion of my Chickahominy Estate and all other Estate Real and personal whatsoever and that my Daughter take pofsefsion of Little Town untill my said Grandson comes of age aforesaid and each to make what they can for themselves out of those parts

I do hereby constitute Authorize and appoint my Son Thomas Bray and my Daughter Elizabeth Allen/so far only as she is concerned as a Legatee/Joint Exor. Of this my Said Will and Testament declaring all former Wills to be void and this to be my Last and only Will and that they each give in an Inventory but no Appraisement of my Estate In Witnefs whereof I have hereunto set my Hand and Seal this Eighteenth day of Nov. anno Dom:1725.

Ja Bray

Signed Sealed and delivered

In the presence of us-----}

Jno Netherland

P:Greenhill

Elizabeth Ballard

At a Court held for James City County March 14th 1725[/26].

The above Last Will and Testament of James Bray Gent:deceased was presented in Court by Thomas Bray Gent one of the Exor therein named who made oath thereto and Liberty is gven Mr. Elizabeth Allen the other Exr to Inventories and the same being also proved by the Oaths of Paschall Greenhill Eliza Ballard and John Netherland all the Witnefses thereto subscribed is admitted to record and Certificate for obtaining a Probat thereof is granted the said Thomas Bray in due form.

Testes

Aleck Archer Clk Court

A Copy Teste

G Dunlevy D.E.C.

An Inventory of the Estate of James Bray Gent deceased taken 30 Jany [1726]

Negroes and Stock at Little Town

Men: Sam, Jack, Caesar, Tom, Jubiter, Jacko, May, Orson, Mark, Brinee, Sandy

Boys: Spring, Martin, Daniel Girls: Lucy.

Women: Moll, Dye, Janny, Batty, Flora, Doll, Nanny, Hope, Debb, Augon, Juno, Judy, Pegg

Stock at Littletown

To 25 head of Cows

To 6 3 and 4 Year old steers

To 8 Cow yearlings & 2 Bulls

Stock at Debbs Quarter

To 10 Cows young and old

To 10 Steers about 7 years old

Stock at Jacko's Quarter

To 18 Steers about 14 years old

To 2 old Bulls

To 13 Cows and 2 year olds

To 45 Sheep young and old

To 24 shoats about a year old

To 5 Breeding sows and

2 Boars

To 5 Barrows about 2 years old

To 30 odd Piggs

To 2 Quart silver Tankards

To 2 silver Candle Cups [Hevey?]

To 1 silver Salvers

To 1 silver Hilted sword and Belt

To 2 large Table Cloths and

2 small ditto [table cloths]

To 1 young horse and

1 Ditto mare

To 2 large looking Glasses

To 3 smaller ditto [looking glasses]

To 1 Doz. maple handle knives

To 12 head of Hoggs, Sows and Barrows

To 16 young Piggs

To 1 pr of stailards and [pca?]

To 4 Oxen & x Cart

To 3 Cart horses and Cart

To 2 saddle Horses

To 2 silver Candle Sticks

To 1 pr ditto [silver] snuffers

To 2 Brafs candle sticks

To 1 pr ditto [brass] snuffers

To 1 Chocolate [pot] &

1 Coffee pot

To 1 old [punt?] and Oars

To 1 Do [boat] [Plate?] 12 [Hhos?]

To 1 Do [boat] [Plate?] 6 [Hhos?]

To 2 small [fishing] Boats

To 1 large Bellmettle skillet

To 1 small ditto [Bell metal skillet]

To 1 Case with 2 razors

To 1 Broad Ax Hammer saw and Chisell

To 1 steel Whipsaw rest & Files

Household Furniture Etc.

- To 5 Feather beds
- To 3 quilts
- 2 Rugs and
- 5 Blanketts
- To 3 pair of hhld. Sheets
- 3 pr. Course [sheets]
- To 4 Doz. Chairs Leather
- To ½ a Doz. Ditto silk Camlete [chairs]
- To 1 Doz. Pewter plates
- 1 Doz. Deep ditto [pewter plates]
- To 6 small [Dishes] &
- 6 large Dishes
- To 1 Clock &
- Several Pictures
- To 1 small [bureau] and
- 1 large Beuro [bureau]
- To 4 Blk Walnut Tables
- To 3 pr. of Andirons
- To 2 pr. of Tongs and
- Fenders Brafs
- To 2 Coats of Arms
- To 3 Grofs & odd Quart Bottles
- To several larger & smaller ditto [bottles]
- To 12 Gallon Stone Jugs
- To large and 2 small Iron potts
- To 12 Cyder Casks 60 Gallons each
- To 1 Brafs Copper or Kettle
- To 1 Large Still [Worm Etc.?
- To 1 saddle Bridle large
- To 1 p of silver spurrs
- To 1 p ditto [silver] shoe Buckles
- To 1 silver headed small Cane
- To ditto [cane] with Amber head
- To 2 Quart silver Tankards
- To 2 silver Candle Cups [Hevey?]
- To 2 Doz. silver spoons
- To 2 silver Salvers
- To 1 large and small Bell metal skillet
- To 1 silver Hilted sword and Belt
- To 2 large Table Cloths and
- 2 small ditto [table cloths]
- To 1 Doz. Diaper napkins
- To 1 Doz. Coarse ditto [napkins]
- To 2 large looking Glafses
- To 3 smaller ditto [looking glasses]
- To 1 Doz. maple handle knives
- To 1 Doz. Do [maple handle] forks
- To 1 pair of money Scales
- To 1 pr of stealyards and [pea?]
- To 4 Oxen & ox Cart
- To 3 Cart horses and Cart
- To 2 saddle Horses
- To 2 silver Candle Sticks
- To 1 pr ditto [silver] snuffers
- To 2 Brafs candle sticks
- To 1 pr ditto [brass] snuffers
- To 1 Chocolate [pot] &
- 1 Coffee pot
- To 1 old [punt?] and Oars
- To 1 Do [boat] [Flate?] 12 [Hhos?]
- To 1 Do [boat] [Flate?] 6 [Hhos?]
- To 2 small [fishing] Boats
- To 1 large Bellmettle skillet
- To 1 small ditto [Bell metal skillet]
- To 1 Case with 2 razors
- To 1 Broad Ax Hamer saw and Chifsell
- To 1 steel Whipsaw rest & Files

Negroes and Stock in Chickahominy

At Rogers's Quarter

Women: Sarah, Queen, Margaret

Men: Frank, George, Ben

Women: Sarah, Judy, Dye

Children: Nanny, Simon

9 Cows and heifers

To 5 large Steers

To 15 Cows and heifers

To 5 2 year olds and 7 calves

To 2 Mares and

2 yearling colts

To 1 Frying pan and

1 Iron pot large

Men &c: Nero, Beauty, Janany, Cuffee, Amy Children

1 Mare and
Colt

To 5 Barrows and

2 sows

To 10 Piggs &

4 shoats

To 1 old Gun and

1 warming pan

At Bridges Quarter

8 Barrows &

Men Etc. To

Luke, Parthenia, Hannah, Dinah, Thunder, Patience, Betty, Phillis, Maria, Peter, Janny,

Parthenia, Lucy Children

To 5 large steers & Venus, Cain, Nanny, Befs, Easter [Easter], Abigail, Tom, Franny,

9 Cows and heifers

To 3 small steers &

1 Bull

6 Cows

To 1 Iron Pott

4 yearlings

to 10 Barrows and

7 sows

To 7 shoats

[15?] piggs

2 sows &

4 shoats

To 6 Piggs &

1 mar

At Rockahock Quarter

Men &c: Ned, Abell, Juno, Eliza, Sugar

To 25 head of Cattle young & old

To 30 Hoggs young & old

The Bray Exr

At a Court held for James City County Dec. / Anno 1726.

At Dubblerums Quarter

Men: Dubblerum, Dick, Sharper
 Women: Sarah, Queen, Margaret
 a Child

To 3 young steers &
 9 Cows and heifers
 To 6 Calves &
 5 2 year olds
 To 1 Bull Stagg &

1 Mare and
 Colt
 To 5 Barrows &
 2 sows from shoats
 5 Piggs

1 Pott

At Nero's Quarter

Men &tc: Nero, Beauty, Jammy, Cuffee, Amy Children

2 sows
 8 Barrows &
 6 piggs

New Kent Quarter

Men &tc.: Jupiter, Venus, Cain, Nanny, Befs, Easltar [Easter], Abigale, Tom, Franny, Patty, Rachael

To 4 large Steers &
 6 Cows
 To 5 2 year olds &
 4 yearlings
 To 6 Barrows

2 sows &
 4 shoats
 To 6 Piggs &
 1 mar

To 2 Iron Potts

At Rockahock Quarter

Men &tc: Ned, Abell, Juno, Eliza, Sugar

To 25 head of Cattle young & old
 To 30 Hoggs young & old

Tho Bray Exr

At a Court hld for James City County Dec. / Anno 1726.

The Inventory of the Estate of James Bray Gent: deceased Being returned into Court
by Thomas Bray Gent: his Exor. is admitted to record.

Teste

Aleck: Archer Clk Court

a Copy Teste

G Dunlevy D.E.C.

Taken by Lewis Burwell Gent:							
Avery John - Tom, Sakey, Bob, Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Allen Thomas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Burwell Lewis Gent. - Edmund	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Burwell's (Thacker's) est. Dick, Peter,							
Robin, Ned, Harry, Anthony, Phil, Peter,							
Lewis, Phil, John, Billey, Bob, Dick, Ned,							
Lewis, Garwin(?), Robin, Phil, Geo,							
James, Fanny, Moll, Mary, Violet, Sarah,							
Isidith, Patt, Fanny, Patt, Penelope, Kinder,							
Harrah, Rachel, Patience, Frank, John,							
Barbery, Kate, Sarah, Nancy, Simon, Geo,							
Quimby(?), Frank, Betty, Nolley, Anna(?),							
Clara, Henrietta, Milley, Lowina(?), John,							
Tampa, Ned, Absalom, Salley, Endora(?),							
Robin, Matt, Billey, Sakey, Harro,							
Bernard, Cesar, Jeff, Geo, Dolley, Anna,							
Armistead, Billey, Sam, Edmund, Phil,							
Arace, Jenny, Newman							
Bragg(?) John							
Burwell Lewis Jun. Dan, Hampton,							
Cesar, Andrew, Isaac, Willie, Egard,							
Tom, Aaron, Spotswood, Betty, Judy,							
Beck, Fanny, Aggy, Sarah, Betty,							
Sarah, Dick, Betty, Sal, Will, Morris,							
Barbery, Patience, Absalom, Bartley,							
Charles, Betty, Dolley, Billey,	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Edmund, Rose, Sarah, Tom, Robin,							
John, Dick, Sarah, Lucy, Michael,							
Lydia, Kate, Lovelace, Hampton, John,							
Nelly, Absalom, Anderson, Chry,							
Aggy, Christopher, Jenny, Claiborne,							
Matty, Milly							

APPENDIX D

Personal Property Tax Lists for Lewis Burwell IV in 1782 and 1783 (Mecklenburg County Personal Property Tax Lists, 1782-1805, M2031, Colonial Williamsburg Rockefeller Library)

1782

<u>Taken by Lewis Burwell Gent.</u>	Free	Slave	Cattle	Horses	Wheels	Tax		
						£	s	d
Avory John – Tom, Sukey, Bob, Nancy, Judy	1	5	12	3		3	9	
Allen Thomas	1		9	1			14	3
Burwell Lewis Genl. - Edmund	1	1		2	4	2	4	
Burwell's (Thacker's) est. Dick, Peter, Robin, Ned, Harry, Anthony, Phil, Peter, Lewis, Phil, John, Billey, Bob, Dick, Ned, Lewis, Garwin(?), Robin, Phil, Geo, James, Fanny, Moll, Mary, Violet, Sarah, Judith, Patt, Fanny, Patt, Penelope, Rinder, Hannah, Rachel, Patience, Frank, Jerry, Barbary, Kate, Sarah, Nancy, Simon, Guy, Quimby(?), Frank, Betty, Nelley, Aron(?), Clare, Henrietta, Milley, Lewisa(?), Eliza, Tempa, Ned, Absalom, Salley, Esther(?), Robin, Matt, Billey, Sukey, Henry, Bernard, Cesar, Jeff, Geo., Dolley, Amy, Armistead, Billey, Sam, Edmund, Philis, Amos, Jenny, Newman		77	132	21	4	43	15	
Bragg(?) John	1			1			2	
Burwell Lewis Jun. Dan, Hampton, Caesar, Andrew, Isaac, Willis, David, Tom, Aaron, Spotswood, Betty, Judy, Beck, Fanny, Aggy, Sarah, Betty, Sarah, Dick, Betty, Sal, Will, Morris, Barbary, Patience, Absalom, Bartley, Charles, Betty, Dolley, Billey, Edmund, Rose, Sarah, Tom, Robin, John, Dick, Sarah, Lucy, Michael, Lydia, Kate, Lovelace, Hampton, John, Nelly, Absalom, Anderson, Clary, Aggy, Christopher, Jenny, Claiborn, Matty, Milly	1	56	60	13	2	31	1	

Taken by Lewis Burwell Gent.	Free	Slave Adult +16	Slave Minor -16	Cattle	Horses	Wheels
Avory John, Tom, Sukey, over 16 — Bob, Nancey, Judy, Molley, under 16	1	2	4	21	4	
Burwell Lewis Junr., Daniel, Hampton, Will, Cesar, Andrew, Isaac, James, David, Tom, Aron, Spotswood, Dick, Billey, Sal, Sarah, Betty, Sarah, Judy, Betty, Fanny, Aggy, Beck, Dolly, Betty, above 16, Morris, Billey, Jacob, Hampton, Edmund, John, Sukey, Barbary, Sarah, Aggy, Sarah, Lucy, Michael, Lyddia, Cate, Lovelace, Rose, Tom, Robin, John, Richard, Izrael, Nelly, Absalom, Anderson, Clary, Frankey, John, Betty, Christian, Jenny, Claiborne, Matt, Dilcey, Patience, Bartley, Charles, Milley, Hank	1	24	39	63	10	
Burwell Lewis, Senr. Edmund	1	1			2	4
Burwell Thacker's Estate, John, Dick, Ned, Bob, Pat, Janney, Penelope, Rachael, Rinder, Hannah, Lewis, Phil, Patience, Frank, Betty, Robin, Peter, Dick, Phil, Anthony, Ned, Harry, Peter, Fanny, Judy, Moll, Mary, Sarah, Violet, Goice, Phil, George, James, Jenny, Frank, Cate, Barbary, Patt, Nan, above 16 — Cesar, Billey, Edmond, Jenny, Alice, Philis, Amos, Newman, Bernard, Robin, Ned, Armistead, Matt, Billy, Aron, Clary, Henrietta, Sam, Milley, Julia, Amy, Eliza, Tempa, Harry, Absalom, Charlotte, Jimmy, George, Dolley, Simon, Cate, Guy, Achilles, Ralph, Salley, Nelly, Esther, Letty, Sukey	1	39	39	162	24	4
Bailey C Roger	1			1	1	

24. Woodward-Jones, Sr. 1st25. Woodward-Jones, Sr. 2nd

26. Utopia Quarter, Period 3,

Sr. 40

APPENDIX E

Chesapeake Slave Quarter Site Comparative Dataset

Site	Site Number (County)	Approx. Date	Square Feet	Sub-Floor Pits	Sub-Floor Pit Density
1. Utopia Quarter, Period 1, Utopia Cottage ^c	44JC32	1675-1700	522	0	0.00
2. Governor's Land, Str. 104 ^j	44JC298	1680-1700	390	14	27.86
3. Kingsmill Tenement, Str. 5 ^c	44JC39	1680-1700	384	3	128.00
4. Bray Kitchen, Str. 1 ^c	44JC34	1700-1720	384	2	192.00
5. Bray Kitchen, Str. 2 ^c	44JC34	1700-1720	384	0	0.00
6. Governor's Land, Str. 103a ^j	44JC298	1700-1720	576	1	576.00
7. Governor's Land, Str. 103b ^j	44JC298	1700-1720	648	2	324.00
8. Atkinson Quarter ^{dd}	44JC648	1700-1720	256	2	128.00
9. Utopia Quarter, Period 2, Str. 1	44JC32	1700-1730	336	6	56.00
10. Utopia Quarter, Period 2, Str. 10	44JC32	1700-1730	563	12	46.92
11. Utopia Quarter, Period 2, Str. 20	44JC32	1700-1730	336	1	336.00
12. Jordan's Journey, Str. 15 ^m	44PG302	1700-1740	308	4	77.00
13. Eden House, Str. 2 ^{aa}	31BR52	1700-1750	384	5	76.80
14. Flowerdew, Site 98, Christine ^r	44PG98	1720-1750	400	4	100.00
15. Harbor View, Str. 27 ^t	44SK192	1720-1760	448	1	448.00
16. Geo. Washington Birthplace, Str. 11 ^p	44ST174	1720-1760	165	1	165.00
17. Newport News Farm Park, #1 ^o	44NN69	1720-1760	432	8	54.00
18. Tutter's Neck Kitchen ^a	44JC45	1720-1760	400	4	100.00
19. Quarter Site ^l	44JC369	1720-1760	192	1	192.00
20. Stonehouse Quarter, Str. 2 ^x	44JC821	1720-1760	384	10	38.40
21. Littletown Quarter, Str. 1 ^c	44JC35	1720-1760	360	2	180.00
22. Littletown Quarter, Str. 2 ^c	44JC35	1720-1760	320	4	80.00
23. Governor's Land, Clay Site, Quarter ^t	44JC546	1720-1760	296	3	98.67
24. Woodward-Jones, Str. 1 ⁿ	44SK147	1720-1760	364.25	3	121.42
25. Woodward-Jones, Str. 2 ⁿ	44SK147	1720-1760	456	2	228.00
26. Utopia Quarter, Period 3, Str. 40	44JC32	1730-1750	192	3	64.00

Site	Site Number (County)	Approx. Date	Square Feet	Sub-Floor Pits	Sub-Floor Pit Density
27. Utopia Quarter, Period 3, Str. 50	44JC32	1730-1750	384	17	22.59
28. Curles Neck Field Quarter ^{aa}	44HE677	1740-1775	--	4	
29. Richneck, Quarter ^u	44WB52	1740-1780	600	15	40.00
30. Bray Quarter ^c	44JC34	1740-1780	144	4	36.00
31. Utopia Quarter, Period 4, Duplex 1	44JC32	1750-1775	374	8	46.75
32. Utopia Quarter, Period 4, Duplex 2	44JC32	1750-1775	330	6	55.00
33. Utopia Quarter, Period 4, Str. 150	44JC32	1750-1775	--	1	150.00
34. Utopia Quarter, Period 4, Str. 160	44JC32	1750-1775	--	1	33.33
35. Kingsmill Quarter, Str. 1 ^c	44JC39	1750-1780	1152	22	52.36
36. Kingsmill Quarter, Str. 2 ^c	44JC39	1760-1780	560	6	93.33
37. Hampton Key ^c	44JC44	1760-1780	672	5	134.40
38. Wilton Duplex 1 ^y	44HE493	1760-1780	360	2	180.00
39. Wilton Duplex 2 ^y	44HE493	1760-1780	360	4	90.00
40. Poplar Forest, North Hill Quarter ^w	44BE94	1760-1780	--	1	
41. Stonehouse Quarter, Str. 1 ^x	44JC821	1760-1780	240	6	40.00
42. Stonehouse Quarter, Str. 3 ^x	44JC821	1760-1780	240	10	24.00
43. Mount Vernon, House for Families ^g	44FX762/ 40	1760-1792	--	1	200
44. Richneck, Str. B ^{aa}	44WB52	1775-1815	--	3	
45. Carter's Grove, House A ^b	44JC110	1780-1800	540	2	270.00
46. Carter's Grove, House B ^b	44JC110	1780-1800	850	13	65.38
47. Carter's Grove, House C ^b	44JC110	1780-1800	180	1	180.00
48. Pope Site, Str. 2 ^e	44SN180	1780-1800	252	1	252.00
49. North Quarter ^c	44JC52	1780-1800	400	3	133.33
50. Monticello, Mulberry Row, House "o" ^s	44AB89	1780-1800	246	2	123.00
51. Monticello, Mulberry Row, House "r" ^s	44AB89	1780-1800	168	1	168.00
52. Monticello, Mulberry Row, House "s" ^s	44AB89	1780-1800	168	1	168.00

Site	Site Number (County)	Approx. Date	Square Feet	Sub-Floor Pits	Sub-Floor Pit Density
53. Monticello, Mulberry Row, House "t" ^s	44AB89	1780-1800	168	1	168.00
54. Magnolia Grange, Str. 1A ^q	44CF344	1780-1800	522	0	0.00
55. Southhall's Quarter, Str. 1 ^{bb}	44JC969	1780-1800	300	2	150.00
56. Southhall's Quarter, Str. 2 ^{bb}	44JC969	1780-1800	300	9	33.33
57. Poplar Forest, Quarter Site, Duplex 1 ^v	44BE94	1780-1800	187.5	1	187.50
58. Poplar Forest, Quarter Site, Duplex 2 ^v	44BE94	1780-1800	187.5	1	.
59. Poplar Forest, Quarter Site, Str. 2 ^v	44BE94	1780-1800	169	0	150.00
60. Poplar Forest, Quarter Site, Str. 3 ^v	44BE94	1780-1800	342.25	0	33.33
61. Piney Grove, Str. 1 ^k	44JC643	1800-1820	54	1	.00
62. Piney Grove, Str. 5 ^k	44JC643	1800-1820	33.75	1	.00
63. Magnolia Grange, Str. 1B ^q	44CCF344	1800-1830	522	3	54.00
64. Monroe Farm, Str. 7 ^q	44PW80	1800-1830	196	1	33.75
65. Gilliam Farm Kitchen ^{h,q}	44PG317	1800-1830	160	0	174.00
66. Betty Hemings Quarter ^z	44AB438	1800-1830	168	0	196.00
67. Monticello, Mulberry Row, House "l" ^{cc}	44AB89	1800-1830	168	0	.00
68. Monroe Farm, Str. 8 ^q	44PW80	1830-1860	180	0	.00
69. Monroe Farm, Str. 9 ^q	44PW80	1830-1860	180	0	.00
70. Wilcox House ^l	44PG114	1830-1860	320	0	.00
71. Pohoke, Str. 1 ^t	44PW335	1830-1860	144	1	144.00
72. Valentine House ^q	CWF29F	1830-1860	375	0	.00
73. Shirley Plantation, House A ^d	44CC135	1840-1860	800	0	.00

^a Noel Hume 1968; ^b Kelso 1971; ^c Kelso 1984; ^d Leavitt 1984; ^e Reinhart 1987; ^f Parker and Hernigle 1990; ^g Pogue and White 1991; ^h Ryder 1991; ⁱ Deetz 1993; ^j Fesler 1993; ^k Higgins et al. 1993; ^l Hunter et al. 1993; ^m Mouer et al. 1993; ⁿ Fesler 1994a; ^o Fesler 1994b; ^p Pogue and White 1994; ^q Samford 1994; ^r Franklin and Bell 1995; ^s Samford 1996; ^t Fesler 1997; ^u Franklin 1997; ^v Heath 1999; ^w Stroud 1999; ^x CRI 2000; ^y Higgins et al. 2000; ^z Neiman et al. 2000; ^{aa} Samford 2000; ^{bb} Pullins 2001; ^{cc} Scholnick et al. 2001; ^{dd} <www.colonialwilliamsburg.com>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, W.W.
1957 *A Virginia Chronology, 1585-1783*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Abrahams, Roger D., and John F. Szwed, eds.
1983 *After Africa: extracts from British travel accounts and journals of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries concerning the slaves, their manners, and customs in the British West Indies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alexander, Rani T.
1999 Mesoamerican House Lots and Archaeological Site Structure: Problems of Inference in Yaxcaba, Yucatan, Mexico, 1750-1847. In *The Archaeology of Household Activities*, ed. Penelope M. Allison, pp. 78-100. London: Routledge.
- Allison, Penelope M., ed.
1999 *The Archaeology of Household Activities*. London: Routledge.
- Amadiume, Ifi
1987 *Male Daughters, Female Husbands: Gender and Sex in an African Society*. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Zed Books, Ltd.
- Aptheker, Herbert
1943 *American Negro Slave Revolts*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ardener, Shirley
1981 Ground Rules and Social Maps for Women: An Introduction. In *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps*, ed. Shirley Ardener, pp. 11-34. London: Croom Helm.
- Armstrong, Douglas V.
1990 *The Old Village and the Great House: An Archaeological and Historical Examination of Drax Hall Plantation, St. Ann's Bay, Jamaica*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Ascher, Robert and Charles Fairbanks
1971 Excavations of a Slave Cabin, Georgia, USA. *Historical Archaeology* V:3-17.
- Ashmore, Wendy, and Richard R. Wilk
1988 Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past. *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, eds. Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, pp. 1-27. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Atkinson, David L., and Adrian Oswald
1969 *London Clay Tobacco Pipes*. Oxford: University Press.

- Barile, Kerri S., and Jamie C. Brandon, eds.
 2004 *Household Chores, Household Choices: Theorizing the Domestic Sphere in Household Archaeology*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Barley, Nigel
 1994 *Smashing Pots: Works of Clay from Africa*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Bauer, Raymond, and Alice Bauer
 1942 Day to Day Resistance to Slavery. *Journal of Negro History* 27:388-419.
- Beaudry, Mary C.
 1989 Household Structure and the Archaeological Record: Examples from New World Historical Sites. In *Households and Communities*, eds. Scott Maceachern, David J.W. Archer, and Richard D. Garvin, pp. 84-92. Calgary: Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary.
 1982 Archaeology and the Historical Household. *Man in the Northeast* 28:27-38.
- Beaudry, Mary C., and Stephen A. Mrozowski, eds.
 1987 *Interdisciplinary Investigations of the Boott Mills, Lowell, Massachusetts. Volume I: Life at the Boardinghouses: A Preliminary Report*. Cultural Resources Management Series 18. National Park Service, North Atlantic Regional Office, Boston.
- Becker, Gary S.
 1981 *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bender, Donald R.
 1967 Refinement of the Concept of Household: Families, Co-residence, and Domestic Functions. *American Anthropologist* 69:493-504.
- Berlin, Ira
 2003 *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- 1998 *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- 1980 Time, Space, and the Evolution of Afro-American Society on British Mainland North America. *American Historical Review* 85:44-78.

Bernardini, Wesley

- 2000 Kiln Firing Groups: Interhousehold Economic Collaboration and Social Organization in the Northeast American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 65(2):365-377.

Beverley, Robert

- 1705 [1947] *The History and Present State of Virginia*. Louis B. Wright ed. Charlottesville: Dominion Books, the University Press of Virginia.

Billingsley, Andrew

- 1992 *Climbing Jacob's Ladder: The Enduring Legacy of African-American Families*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- 1968 *Black Families in White America*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Binford, Lewis

- 1987 Researching Ambiguity: Frames of Reference and Site Structure. In *Method and Theory for Activity Area Research: An Ethnoarchaeological Approach*, ed. Susan Kent, pp. 449-512. New York: Columbia University Press.

- 1967 Smudge Pits and Hide Smoking: The Use of Analogy in Archaeological Reasoning. *American Antiquity* 32:1-12.

- 1962a Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28:217-225.

- 1962b A New Method of Calculating Dates from Kaolin Pipe Stem Samples. *Southeastern Archaeological Conference Newsletter* 9(1):19-21.

Blacklow, Paul, and Ranjan Ray

- 2003 Intra-Household Resource Allocation, Consumer Preferences and Commodity Tax Reforms: Australian Evidence. *The Economic Record* 79(247):425-440.

Blanton, Richard

- 1994 *Houses and Households: A Comparative Study*. New York: Plenum Press.

Blassingame, John W.

- 1972 *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blight, David W.

- 1995 "Analyze the Sounds": Frederick Douglass's Invitation to Modern Historians of Slavery. In *Slave Cultures and Cultures of Slavery*, ed. Stephan Palmie, pp. 1-11. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

- Boles, John B.
1983 *Black Southerners, 1619-1869*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Bourdier, Jean-Paul, and Trinh T. Minh-ha
1985 *African Spaces: Designs for Living in Upper Volta*. New York: Africana Publishing Company.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1971 The Berber House. In *Rules and Meanings: The Anthropology of Everyday Knowledge*, ed. Mary Douglas, pp. 98-110. Suffolk, Great Britain: Penguin Education.
- Boyd, Donna C., and C. Clifford Boyd, Jr.
1996 An Osteological Analysis of 18th Century Human Skeletal Remains from Utopia I (44JC32), Kingsmill on the James, James City County, Virginia. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Brathwaite, Edward Kamau
1971 *The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica: 1770-1820*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bray, James
1725 James Bray (II) Will and Inventory. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Rockefeller Library, Williamsburg, Virginia. (Appendix C)
- Brewer, Holly
1997 Entailing Aristocracy in Colonial Virginia: "Ancient Feudal Restraints" and Revolutionary Reform. *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, LIV(2):307-346.
- Brown, Kathleen M.
1996 *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Brown, Michael F.
1996 On Resisting Resistance. *American Anthropologist* 98(4):729-735.
- Brown, Kenneth, and Doreen Cooper
1990 Structural Continuity in an African-American Slave and Tenant Community. *Historical Archaeology* 24(4):7-19.
- Burwell, George Harrison, ed.
1961 Sketch of Carter Burwell (1716-1756). Privately published, Millwood, Virginia.

- Burwell, Lewis IV
1782-1783 Personal Property Tax Lists, 1782-1805, M2031 microfilm, Colonial Williamsburg Rockefeller Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Burwell Petition
1759 Petition of Lewis Burwell. Public Records Office, Privy Council, PRO/PC 2/106, Survey Report 6108, p. 487. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Rockefeller Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Burwell v. Johnson
1758 Lewis and Frances Burwell vs. Philip and Elizabeth Johnson. British Museum Additional Manuscripts 36, 218, pp. 138-143. Microfilm 284. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Rockefeller Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Burwell Papers
James Bray Ledger 1736-1746. In Burwell Account Book No. 1, folios 100-123. Microfilm M-1558 (formerly M-96-1). Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Rockefeller Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Bush, Barbara
1986 "The Family Tree is Not Cut": Women and Cultural Resistance in Slave Family Life in the British Caribbean. In *In Resistance: Studies in African, Caribbean, and Afro-American History*, ed. Gary Y. Okihiro, pp. 117-132. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Byrd, William
1841 *The Westover Manuscripts: Containing the History of the Dividing Line betwixt Virginia and North Carolina; A Journey to the Land of Eden, A. D. 1733: and a Progress to the Mines*. Edmund Ruffin, ed. Petersburg, Virginia: E. and J. C. Ruffin. Electronic document, <<http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/byrd/byrd.html>>
- Callaway, Helen
1993 "The Most Essentially Female Function of All": Giving Birth. *Defining Females: The Nature of Women in Society*, ed. Shirley Ardener, pp. 146-167. Providence, Rhode Island: Berg Publishers Ltd.
1981 Spatial Domains and Women's Mobility in Yorubaland, Nigeria. *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps*, ed. Shirley Ardener, pp. 168-186. London: Croom Helm.
- Carr, Lois Green, Russell R. Menard, and Lorena S. Walsh
1991 *Robert Cole's World: Agriculture & Society in Early Maryland*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Carr, Lois Green, and Lorena S. Walsh

- 1988 Economic Diversification and Labor Organization in the Chesapeake, 1650-1820. *Work and Labor in Early America*, ed. Stephen Innes, pp. 144-188. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Carson, Cary

- 1994 The Consumer Revolution in Colonial British America: Why Demand? In *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, pp. 483-697. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

- 1974 The "Virginia House" in Maryland. *Maryland Historical Magazine* 69(2):185-196.

Carson, Cary, Norman F. Barka, William M. Kelso, Gary Wheeler Stone, and Dell Upton

- 1981 Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies. *Winterthur Portfolio* 16:135-196.

Casey, Joanna

- 1991 One Man No Chop: Gender Roles in the Domestic Economy in Northern Ghana, West Africa. *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference*, eds. Dale Walde and Noreen D. Willows, pp. 137-143. Calgary: University of Calgary Archaeological Association.

Chambers, Douglas B.

- 1996 'He Gwine Sing He Country': Africans, Afro-Virginians, and the Development of Slave Culture in Virginia, 1690-1810. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

- 1992 Afro-Virginian Root Cellars and African Roots?: A Comment on the Need or a Moderate Afrocentric Approach. *African-American Archaeology* 6:7-9.

Chapman, William

- 1991 Slave Villages in the Danish West Indies: Changes of the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries. In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, IV*, eds. Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, pp. 108-120. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Chappell, Edward A.

- 1999 Museums and American Slavery. In *"I, Too, Am America": Archaeological Studies of African-American Life*, ed. Theresa A. Singleton, pp. 240-258. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

- 1994 *Housing a Nation: The Transformation of Living Standards in Early America*. In *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, pp. 167-232. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Cody, Cheryl Ann
- 1982 Naming, Kinship, and Estate Dispersal: Notes on Slave Family Life on a South Carolina Plantation, 1786-1833. *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series 39(1):192-211.
- Colonial Williamsburg Foundation
- 2002 The Atkinson Site. Electronic document, <<http://www.history.org/History/argy/MHPage/WhoWasAtkinson.htm>>
- 1986 *Toward a Resource Protection Process: James City County, York County, City of Poquoson, City of Williamsburg*. Marley R. Brown III and Kathleen J. Bragdon, eds. Four volumes. Electronic document, <<http://www.history.org/History/argy/publications/pubms1.cfm>>
- Cook, and Heizer
- 1968 Relationships among Houses, Settlement Areas, and Population in Aboriginal California. In *Settlement Archaeology*, ed. K.C. Chang, pp. 79-116. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books.
- Cotter, John L.
- 1958 *Archaeological Excavations at Jamestown, Virginia*. Washington D.C.: National Park Service.
- Craven, Wesley Frank
- 1971 *White, Red, and Black: The Seventeenth Century Virginian*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- 1949 *The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 1607-1689*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press.
- Creel, Darrell, and Roger Anyon
- 2003 New Interpretations of Mimbres Public Architecture and Space: Implications for Cultural Change. *American Antiquity* 68(1):67-92.
- Cultural Resources, Inc.
- 2000 Preliminary Site Report for the Stonehouse Quarter, James City County, Virginia. Cultural Resources, Inc., Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Cummings, Linda Scott, and Thomas E. Moutoux

- 1999 Pollen and Phytolith Analysis at the Utopia Site, 44JC32, Virginia. Paleo Research Labs Technical Report 98-20. Manuscript on file, James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.

Curtin, Phillip

- 1969 *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

David, Nicholas

- 1971 The Fulani Compound and the Archaeologist. *World Archaeology* 3(2):111-131.

Davis, Angela Y.

- 1981 *Women, Race & Class*. New York: Vintage Books.

- 1971 Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves. *Black Scholar* 3(4):2-15.

Davis, David Brion

- 1997 A Review of the Conflicting Theories on the Slave Family. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 16:100-103.

Dawdy, Shannon Lee

- 2000 Preface. Theme issue, "Creolization," *Historical Archaeology* 34(3):1-4.

Deagan, Kathleen A.

- 1996 *Fort Mose : Colonial America's Black Fortress of Freedom*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida

- 1983 *Spanish St. Augustine : the Archaeology of a Colonial Creole Community*. New York: Academic Press.

Deal, Douglas J.

- 1993 *Race and Class in Colonial Virginia: Indians, Englishmen, and Africans on the Eastern Shore during the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Garland.

Deaton, Angus, and C. Paxton

- 1998 Economies of Scale, Household Size, and the Demand for Food. Electronic document, <<http://econpapers.hhs.se/paper/fthpriwds/178.htm>>

de Dauphine, Durand

- 1934 *A Huguenot Exile in Virginia, 1687*, translated and edited by Gilbert Chenard. New York: Press of the Pioneers.

Deetz, James F.

- 1996 *In Small Things Forgotten: An Archaeology of Early American Life*. New York: Anchor Books.

- 1995 Cultural Dimensions of Ethnicity in the Archaeological Record. Keynote address, 28th annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Washington, D.C.

- 1993 *Flowerdew Hundred: The Archaeology of a Virginia Plantation, 1619-1864*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

- 1987 Harrington Histograms Versus Binford Mean Dates as a Technique for Establishing the Occupational Sequence of Sites at Flowerdew Hundred, Virginia. *American Archeology* 6(1):62-67.

- 1982 Households: A Structural Key to Archaeological Explanation. *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(6):717-724.

- 1965 The Dynamics of Stylistic Change in Arikara Ceramics. *Illinois Studies in Anthropology*, No. 4. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Diehl, Michael W.

- 1998 The Interpretation of Archaeological Floor Assemblages: A Case Study from the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 63(4):617-634.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton

- 1990 The Dialectics of Black Womanhood. In *Black Women in America: Social Sciences Perspectives*, eds. Micheline R. Malson, Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi, Jean F. O'Barr, and Mary Wyer, pp. 65-78. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dodson, Jualynne

- 1988 Conceptualizations of Black Families. *Black Families* Second Edition, ed. Harriette Pipes McAdoo, pp. 77-90. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Dollarhide, William

- 2001 Dowry vs. Dower Rights. *Genealogy Bulletin: A Heritage Quest Publication*. Electronic document, <<http://www.genealogybulletin.com/archives/HTML/current70.html>>

Donley-Reid, Linda W.

- 1990 A Structuring Structure: The Swahili House. In *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space: An Interdisciplinary Cross-Cultural Study*, ed. Susan Kent, pp. 114-126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Du Bois, W.E. Burghardt, ed.

1908 [1969] *The Negro American Family*. New York: Negro Universities Press.

Douglas, Mary, and Baron Isherwood

1979 *The World of Goods*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Edwards, Andrew C., and Marley R. Brown III

1993 Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake Settlement Patterns: A Current Perspective from Tidewater Virginia. In *The Archaeology of 17th-Century Virginia*, eds. Theodore R. Reinhart and Dennis J. Pogue, pp. 285-310. Richmond: Dietz Press.

Edwards, Jay

1991 The Evolution of a Vernacular Tradition. In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, IV*, eds. Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, pp. 75-86. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Elkins, Stanley M.

1976 *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life*, Third Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ellison, Ralph

1953 [1994] *Shadow and Act*. New York: Quality Paperback Book Club.

Emerson, Matthew

1999 African Inspirations in a New World Art and Artifact: Decorated Pipes from the Chesapeake. In *"I, Too, Am America": Archaeological Studies of African-American Life*, ed. Theresa A. Singleton, pp. 47-82. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Fessler, Garrett R.

1994 Decorated Clay Tobacco Pipes from the Chesapeake: An African Connection. In *Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake*, eds. Paul Shackel and Barbara Little, pp. 35-49. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Eltis, David

1998 Age and Sex: the Slave Trade in Comparative Perspective. Paper delivered at the Transatlantic Slaving and African Diaspora: Using the W.E.B. DuBois Institute Dataset of Slaving Voyages Conference. Williamsburg, Virginia.

Emery, Lynne F.

1972 *Black Dance in the United States from 1619 to 1970*. Palo Alto: National Press Books.

- Engerman, Stanley
 1978 Economic Perspective on the Life Course. In *Transitions: the Family and the Life Course in Historical Perspective*, ed. Tamara K. Hareven, pp. 274-286. New York: Academic Press.
- Fage, J.D.
 1989 Slaves and Society in Western Africa, 1445-c. 1700. In *The African Diaspora: Africans and Their Descendants in the Wider World to 1800*, eds. the Black Diaspora Committee of Howard University, pp. 145-163. Needham Heights, Massachusetts, Ginn Press.
- Fairbanks, Charles
 1972 The Kingsley Slave Cabins in Duval County, Florida, 1968. *Conference on Historic Sites Archaeology Papers*, 1971 7:62-93.
- Farnham, Christie
 1987 Sapphire? The Issue of Dominance in the Slave Family, 1830-1865. "To Toil the Livelong Day": *America's Women at Work, 1780-1980*, eds. Carol Groneman and Mary Beth Norton, pp. 68-83. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Fennell, Christopher C.
 2003 Group Identity, Individual Creativity, and Symbolic Generation in a BaKongo Diaspora. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 7(1):1-31.
- Ferguson, Leland
 1992 *Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Early African America, 1650-1800*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Fesler, Garrett R.
 2004 Living Arrangements among Enslaved Women and Men at an Early Eighteenth-Century Virginia Quarters Site. In *Engendering African-American Archaeology: A Southern Perspective*, eds. Jillian E. Galle and Amy L. Young. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- 2001 Back to Utopia: An Interim Report on Renewed Archaeological Excavations at the Utopia Quarter, Field Seasons 1993-1996. Results of Shovel Testing. Volume I. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- 2000 Back to Utopia: An Interim Report on Renewed Archaeological Excavations at the Utopia Quarter, Field Seasons 1993-1996. Period 1 Occupation, ca. 1700-1730. Volume I. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.

- 1997a Landscapes of Control and Autonomy: The Spatial Contestation of the Utopia Slave Quarter. A paper presented to the University of Virginia, Department of Anthropology, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- 1997b A Quantitative Study of Architectural Change in Slave Housing in the Piedmont and Chesapeake Regions of Virginia. Manuscript on file at James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- 1997c Phase I Archaeological Survey of 270 Acres at the Former Camp Wallace Army Training Base at Kingsmill on the James, James City County, Virginia. Report submitted to Busch Properties, Inc. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- 1995 Quartering Sites in Late 17th and 18th-Century Virginia: Separating the Slaves, Servants, Tenants, and Planters. Paper presented at the 28th annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- 1994a The Woodward-Jones House (44SK147): The Archaeology of an 18th-Century Tenant Farm. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- 1994b A Phase II Archaeological Significance Evaluation of 44NN69 at the Riverview Farm Park in the City of Newport News, Virginia. The Virginia Company Foundation, Williamsburg.
- 1993 The Governor's Tenants Under Captain Whittaker: Archaeology at 44JC298, at the Governor's Land at Two Rivers. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- 1992 A Preliminary Report of Site 44JC546, Governor's Land at Two Rivers, James City County, Virginia. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- 1991 A Preliminary Report of the Harbor View Site (44SK192). James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Fesler, Garrett R. and Maria Franklin
 1999 The Exploration of Ethnicity and the Historical Archaeological Record. In *Historical Archaeology, Identity Formation, and the Interpretation of Ethnicity*, eds. Maria Franklin and Garrett Fesler, pp. 1-10. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Research Publications. Richmond: Dietz Press.

Fithian, Philip Vickers

- 1957 *Journal & Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian, 1773-1774: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion*. Hunter Dickinson Farish, ed. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia.

Fitzhugh, William

- 1963 *William Fitzhugh and his Chesapeake World, 1676-1701*. Richard Beale Davis, ed. Chapel Hill: Published for the Virginia Historical Society by the University of North Carolina Press.

Flannery, Kent G.

- 2002 The Origins of the Village Revisited: From Nuclear to Extended Households. *American Antiquity* 67(3):417-433.

Flannery, Kent G., ed.

- 1976 *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. New York: Academic Press.

Flannery, Kent, and Marcus Winter

- 1976 Analyzing Household Activities. In *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. Kent Flannery, ed. Pp. 25-34. New York: Academic Press.

Fogel, Robert William

- 1989 *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Fogel, Robert W., and Stanley L. Engerman

- 1974 *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery*. New York: Little Brown.

Fox, Georgia L.

- 1999 The Kaolin Clay Tobacco Pipe Collection from Port Royal, Jamaica. In *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe*, ed. Peter Davey, pp. 102-118. Oxford: British Archaeology Reports International Series 809.

Fox, Robin

- 1967 *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth.

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

- Franklin, Maria
 1997 *Out of Site, Out of Mind: The Archaeology of an Enslaved Virginian Household, ca. 1740-1778*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.
- Franklin, Maria, and Alison Bell
 1995 On the Medieval Side of the Georgian Threshold. Paper delivered at the Mid-Atlantic Archaeology Conference, Ocean City, Maryland.
- Frazier, E. Franklin
 1949 *The Negro in the United States*. Macmillan Press, New York.
 1939 [2001] *The Negro Family in the United States*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
 1932 *The Negro Family in Chicago*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
 1930 The Negro Slave Family. *Journal of Negro History* 15:198-259.
- Furstenberg, Frank F., Jr., Theodore Hershberg, and John Modell
 1975 The Origins of the Female-Headed Black Family: The Impact of the Urban Experience. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* VI (2):211-233.
- Galenson, David
 1981 *White Servitude in Colonial America: An Economic Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Galke, Laura
 2000 Did the Gods of Africa Die?: A Re-examination of a Carroll House Crystal Assemblage. *North American Archaeologist* 21(1):19-33.
- Galle, Jillian
 2004 Designing Women: Measuring Acquisition and Access at the Hermitage Plantation. In *Engendering African-American Archaeology: A Southern Perspective*, eds. Jillian E. Galle and Amy L. Young. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Genovese, Eugene D.
 1976 *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gibb, James G.
 1996 *The Archaeology of Wealth: Consumer Behavior in English America*. New York: Plenum Press.

Gibb, James G., and Julia A. King

- 1991 Gender, Activity Areas, and Homelots in the 17th-Century Chesapeake Region. *Historical Archaeology* 25(4), pp. 109-131.

Gibson, John

- 2002 Why Does the Engel Method Work? Food Demand, Economics of Size, and Household Survey Methods. Electronic document, <<http://ideas.repec.org/p/wai/econwp/02-02.html>>

Glassie, Henry

- 1975 *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- 1968 *Pattern in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goheen, Miriam

- 1996 *Men Own the Fields, Women Own the Crops: Gender and Power in the Cameroon Grassfields*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Gomez, Michael A.

- 1998 *Exchanging our Country Marks: The Transformation of African Identities in the Colonial and Antebellum South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Goodwin, Mary R.M.

- 1958 Kingsmill Plantation, James City County. Ms., Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Goody, Jack

- 1976 *Production and Reproduction: A Comparative Study of the Domestic Domain*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 1973 *The Character of Kinship*. Cambridge, England: University Press.
- 1972 The Evolution of the Family. In *Household and Family in Past Time*, eds. Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, pp. 103-124. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press.
- 1971 *Kinship: Selected Readings*. Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- 1962 *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups*. Cambridge, England: Published for the Dept. of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University Press.

Hansen, Lee

- 1969 Kaolin Pipestems—Boring in on a Fallacy. *Historical Site Archaeology* 4:2-15.

- Gottman, Jean
 1955 *Virginia at Mid-Century*. Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Greene, Jack P., ed.
 1987 *The Diary of Colonel Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, 1752-1778*. Richmond: Virginia Historical Society.
- Gundaker, Grey
 1998 Introduction: Home Ground. In *Keep Your Head to the Sky: Interpreting African American Home Ground*, ed. Grey Gundaker, pp. 3-23. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
 1993 Tradition and Innovation in African-American Yards. *African Arts* 26:58-71.
- Gundersen, Joan R.
 1998 Elizabeth Bray Allen. In *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, vol. 1 Aaroe-Blanchfield, eds. John T. Kneebone, J. Jefferson Looney, Brent Tarter, and Sandra Gioia Treadway, pp. 77-78. Richmond: The Library of Virginia.
- Gutman, Herbert.
 1976 *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom: 1750-1925*. New York: Random House.
 1975 Persistent Myths about the Afro-American Family. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, The History of the Family 6(2):181-210.
- Hagstrum, Melissa
 2001 Household Production in Chaco Canyon Society. *American Antiquity* 66(1):47-55.
- Hall, Edward T.
 1990 *The Hidden Dimension*. New York: Anchor Books Doubleday.
- Hammel, E.A., and Peter Laslett
 1974 Comparing Household Structure Over Time and Between Cultures. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16:73-111.
- Handler, Jerome S., and Frederick W. Lange
 1978 *Plantation Slavery in Barbados: An Archaeological and Historical Investigation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Hanson, Lee
 1969 Kaolin Pipestems—Boring In on a Fallacy. *Historical Site Archaeology* 4:2-15.

Hareven, Tamara K.

- 1991 The History of the Family and the Complexity of Social Change. *The American Historical Review* 96(1):95-124.

Harrington, J.C.

- 1954 Dating Stem Fragments of Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Clay Tobacco Pipes. *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia* 9(1).

Hayden, Brian, and Aubrey Cannon

- 1984 *The Structure of Material Systems: Ethnoarchaeology in the Maya Highlands*. SAA Papers No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.

- 1983 Where the Garbage Goes: Refuse Disposal in the Maya Highlands. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 2:117-163.

Hazard, David K.

- 1972 Field notes for 44JC32, 44JC68, 44JC69. On file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond.

Heath, Barbara J.

- 1999 *Hidden Lives: The Archaeology of Slave Life at Thomas Jefferson's Poplar Forest*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Heath, Barbara, and Amber Bennett

- 2000 'The little Spots allow'd them': The Archaeological Study of African-American Yards. *Historical Archaeology* 34(2):38-55.

Heighton, Robert F., and Kathleen A. Deagan

- 1971 A New Formula for Dating Kaolin Clay Pipestems. *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers* 6:220-229.

Hendon, Julia

- 1996 Archaeological Approaches to the Organization of Domestic Labor: Household Practice and Domestic Relations. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25:45-61.

Hening, William W., ed.

- 1969 *The Statutes at Large, Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia, from the First Session of the Legislature in the Year 1619*. 13 volumes. Charlottesville: Published for the Jamestown Foundation of the Commonwealth of Virginia by the University Press of Virginia

Herman, Bernard L.

- 1984 Slave Quarters in Virginia: The Persona Behind Historic Artifacts. In *The Scope of Historical Archaeology: Essays in Honor of John L. Cotter*, eds. David G. Orr and Daniel G. Crozier, pp. 253-283. Philadelphia: Laboratory of Anthropology, Temple University.

Higgins, Thomas F.

- 2000 Wilton Plantation Report. William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Higgins, Thomas F., and Charles M. Downing

- 1993 Phase III Data Recovery at Site 44JC643 Associated with the Proposed VNG Mechanicsville to Kingsmill Lateral Pipeline, James City County, Virginia. The William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Higman, Barry W.

- 1978 African and Creole Slave Family Patterns I Trinidad. *Journal of Family History* 3(2):163-180.
- 1975 The Slave Family and Household in the British West Indies, 1800-1834. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* VI(2):261-287.

Hill, Robert B.

- 1999 *The Strengths of African American Families*. Lanham, Md. : University Press of America.

- 1972 *The Strengths of Black Families*. New York: Emerson Hall.

Hillier, Bill, and Julianne Hanson

- 1984 *The Social Logic of Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hodder, Ian

- 1987 The Meaning of Discard: Ash and Domestic Space in Baringo. In *Method and Theory for Activity Area Research: An Ethnoarchaeological Approach*, ed. Susan Kent, pp. 424-448. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hodges, Robert L., P. Ben Sabo, David McCloy, and C. Kent Staples

- 1985 Soil Survey of James City and York Counties and the City of Williamsburg, Virginia. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service.

hooks, bell

- 1981 *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston: South End Press.

Horn, James

- 1979 *Servant Emigration to the Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century*. In *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*, eds. Thad W. Tate and David Ammerman, pp. 51-95. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press.

Horowitz, Andrew W.

- 2002 *Household Size and the Demand for Food: A Puzzle Resolved?* Electronic document, <<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/Econ/monstaweaver/sempapers/Grant.pdf>>

Huggins, Nathan

- 1977 *Black Odyssey: The African American Ordeal in Slavery*. New York: Vintage Books.

- 1971 *Harlem Renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hunter, Robert R., Jr., Jane Smith, Thomas Higgins III, Martha McCartney, and Ann Smart Martin

- 1993 *Phase III Data Recovery of Significant Archaeological Resources within the Proposed Route 199 Extension Corridor*. The William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Isaac, Rhys

- 1982 *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Jones, Jacqueline.

- 1989 "My Mother Was Much of a Woman": Black Women, Work, and the Family Under Slavery. In *Women and the Family in a Slave Society*, ed. Paul Finkelman, pp. 195-229. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

- 1985 *Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work and the Family from Slavery to the Present*. New York: Basic Books.

Jones, Steven L.

- 1985 *The African-American Tradition in Vernacular Architecture*. In *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*, ed. Theresa A. Singleton, pp. 195-213. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.

Jordan, Terry G., and Matti Kaups

- 1989 *The American Backwoods Frontier: An Ethnic and Ecological Interpretation*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

- Jordan, Winthrop D.
 1968 *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Joyner, Charles
 1989 Creolization. In *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, eds. Charles Reagan Wilson and William Ferris, pp. 147-149. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 1984 *Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Katz-Hyman, Martha B.
 1993 "'In the Middle of this Poverty Some Cups and a Teapot': The Material Culture of Slavery in Eighteenth-Century Virginia and the Furnishing of Slave Quarters at Colonial Williamsburg." Research Report. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Keim, Curtis A.
 1983 Women in Slavery among the Mangbetu. In *Women and Slavery in Africa*, eds. Claire C. Robertson and Martin A. Klein, pp. 144-159. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kelso, William M.
 1997 *Archaeology at Monticello: Artifacts of Everyday Life in the Plantation Community*. Charlottesville: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation.
- 1995 Archaeology of Chesapeake Common Folks: Artifacts of Definition and Change Among the Rich and Poor at Kingsmill and Monticello, 1650-1810. In *Common People and Their Material World: Free Men and Women in the Chesapeake, 1700-1830*, eds. David Harvey and Gregory Brown, pp. 75-93. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Research Publications. Richmond: Dietz Press.
- 1984 *Kingsmill Plantations, 1619-1800: Archaeology of Country Life in Colonial Virginia*. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.
- 1977 An Interim Report on Historical Archaeology at Kingsmill: The 1975 Season. Virginia Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown.
- 1976 Historical Archaeology at Kingsmill: The 1974 Season. Virginia Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown.
- 1974 An Interim Report on the Excavation at Kingsmill Plantation: The 1973 Season. Virginia Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown.

- 1973 An Interim Report on Historical Archaeology at Kingsmill, the 1972 Season. Virginia Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown.
- 1972 A Report on Exploratory Excavations at Carter's Grove Plantation, James City County, Virginia (June 1970-September 1971). On file Jamestown Rediscovery Project, Jamestown, Virginia.
- Kelso, William M., Nicholas M. Lucchetti, and Beverly A. Straube
1998 *Jamestown IV Rediscovery*. Richmond: Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities.
- Kent, Susan
1999 The Archaeological Visibility of Storage: Delineating Storage from Trash Areas. *American Antiquity* 64(1):79-94.
1990 A Cross-Cultural Study of Segmentation, Architecture, and the Use of Space. In *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space: An Interdisciplinary Cross-Cultural Study*, ed. Susan Kent, pp. 127-152. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1987 Understanding the Use of Space: An Ethnoarchaeological Approach. In *Method and Theory for Activity Area Research: An Ethnoarchaeological Approach*, ed. Susan Kent, pp. 1-60. New York: Columbia University Press.
1984 *Analyzing Activity Areas: An Ethnoarchaeological Study of the Use of Space*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Kimber, Edward
1907 Observations in Several Voyages and Travels in America in *William and Mary Quarterly* Series 1, XV(No. 3):143-158.
- Kimmel, Richard H.
1993 Notes on the Cultural Origins and Functions of Sub-Floor Pits. *Historical Archaeology* 27(3):102-117.
- Klingelhofer, Eric
1987 Aspects of Early Afro-American Culture: Artifacts from Slave Quarters at Garrison Plantation. *Historical Archaeology* 21(2):112-119.
- Kolchin, Peter
1993 *American Slavery, 1619-1877*. New York: Hill and Wang.
1987 *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

- 1983 Reevaluating the Antebellum Slave Community: A Comparative Perspective. *The Journal of American History* 70(3):579-601.
- Kramer, Carol
- 1979 An Archaeological View of a Contemporary Kurdish Village: Domestic Architecture, Household Size, and Wealth. In *Ethnoarchaeology: Implications of Ethnography for Archaeology*, ed. Carol Kramer, pp. 139-163. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kruft, Hanno-Walter
- 1994 *A History of Architectural Theory: From Vitruvius to the Present*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Kulikoff, Allan
- 1986 *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 1978 The Origins of Afro-American Society in Tidewater Maryland and Virginia, 1700-1790. *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 35(2):226-259.
- 1977a The Beginnings of the Afro-American Family in Maryland. *Law, Society, and Politics in Early Maryland*, eds. Aubrey C. Land, Lois Green Carr, and Edward C. Papenfuse, pp. 171-196. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- 1977b A "Prolifick" People: Black Population Growth in the Chesapeake Colonies, 1700-1790. *Southern Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the South*, XVI(4):391-428.
- LaMotta, Vincent M., and Michael B. Schiffer
- 1999 Formation Processes of House Floor Assemblages. In *The Archaeology of Household Activities*, ed. Penelope M. Allison, pp. 19-29. London: Routledge.
- Lanier, Gabrielle M., and Bernard L. Herman
- 1997 *Everyday Architecture of the Mid-Atlantic: Looking at Buildings and Landscapes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Laslett, Peter
- 1972 Introduction: The History of the Family. *Household and Family in Past Time*, eds. Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, pp. 1-89. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press.
- Lawrence, Denise L., and Setha M. Low
- 1990 The Built Environment and Spatial Form. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19:453-505.

- Leach, Neil, ed.
1997 *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Leavitt, Genevieve
1984 Slaves and Tenant Farmers at Shirley. In *The Archaeology of Shirley Plantation*, ed. Theodore Reinhart, pp. 156-188. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Lee, Jean Butenhoff
1986 The Problem of Slave Community in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake. *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, 43(3):333-361.
- Leone, Mark P., and Gladys-Marie Fry
1999 Conjuring in the Big House Kitchen: An Interpretation of African American Belief Systems Based on the Uses of Archaeology and Folklore Sources. *Journal of American Folklore* 112(445):372-403.
- Levanthal, Richard M., and Kevin H. Baxter
1988 The Use of Ceramics to Identify the Function of Copan Structures. In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, eds. Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, pp. 51-71. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Levi, Primo
1958 [1996] *Survival in Auschwitz: The Nazi Assault on Humanity*. Stuart Woolf, trans. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Levine, Lawrence
1977 *Black Culture, Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lightfoot, Kent G., Antoinette Martinez, and Ann M. Schiff
1998 Daily Practice and Material Culture in Pluralistic Social Settings: An Archaeological Study of Culture Change and Persistence from Fort Ross, California. *American Antiquity* 63(2):199-222.
- Lightfoot, Kent G., and Gary M. Feinman
1982 Social Differentiation and Leadership Development in Early Pithouse Villages in the Mogollon Region of the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 47:64-86.
- Linares, Olga F.
1984 Households among the Diola of Senegal: Should Norms Enter by the Front or the Back Door? *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, eds. Robert McC. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, pp. 407-445. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Linebaugh, Donald W.

- 1994 "All the Annoyances and Inconveniences of the Country": Environmental Factors in the Development of Outbuildings in the Colonial Chesapeake. *Winterthur Portfolio* 29(1):1-18.

Locke, Alain L.

- 1940 *The Negro in Art: A Pictorial Record of the Negro Artists and the Negro Theme in Art*. Washington, D.C.: Associates in Negro Folk Education.

Lukezic, Craig

- 1990 Soils and Settlement Location in 18th Century Colonial Tidewater Virginia. *Historical Archaeology* 24(1): 1-17.

McClure, James P.

- 1977 Littleton Plantation, 1700-1745. Master's thesis, Department of History, College of William and Mary. Williamsburg, Virginia.

McCracken, Grant

- 1988 *Culture & Consumption*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

McCusker, John J., and Russell R. Menard

- 1985 *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

McIlwaine, H.R., ed.

- 1910 *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1727-1734, 1736-1740*. Richmond: Virginia State Library.

McKee, Larry W.

- 1992 The Ideals and Realities Behind the Design and Use of 19th Century Virginia Slave Cabins. *The Art and Mystery of Historical Archaeology: Essays in Honor of James Deetz*, eds, Anne E. Yentsch and Mary C. Beaudry, pp. 195-212. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
- 1988 Plantation Food Supply in Nineteenth-Century Tidewater Virginia. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

McKelway, Henry S., Gary D. Crites, Lance K. Greene, and Amy L. Young

- 2000 Slaves and Masters in the Upland South: Data Recovery at the Mabry Site (40KN86), Knox County, Tennessee. Tennessee Department of Transportation, Office of Environmental Planning and Permits. Publications in Archaeology No. 6. Nashville, Tennessee.

- MacAdoo, Harriette Pipes
1988 *Black Families*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw
1913 [1963] *The Family among the Australian Aborigines, a Sociological Study*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Mallios, Seth
2000 Back to the Bowl: A Method of Determining White Ball-Clay Pipebowl Mean Dates and its Results on the Jamestown Rediscovery Assemblage and Beyond. Paper delivered at the annual Jamestown Conference, Jamestown, Virginia, November 29.
- Malone, Ann Patton
1992 *Sweet Chariot: Slave Family and Household Structure in Nineteenth Century Louisiana*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mann, Susan A.
1990 Slavery, Sharecropping, and Sexual Identity. *Black Women in America: Social Science Perspectives*, eds. Micheline R. Malson, Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi, Jean F. O'Barr, and Mary Wyer, pp. 133-157. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, Ann Smart
1993 Buying into the World of Goods: Eighteenth-Century Consumerism and Retail Trade from London to the Virginia Frontier. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Marzio, Peter C.
1972 Carpentry in the Southern Colonies during the Eighteenth Century with Emphasis on Maryland and Virginia. *Winterthur Portfolio* 7:229-250.
- May, Jamie, and Eric Deetz
1997 Architectural Determinates in Root Cellar Placement. Paper delivered at the 30th annual meeting of the Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology, Corpus Christi, Texas.
- Menard, Russell R.
1988 British Migration to the Chesapeake Colonies in the Seventeenth Century. In *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, eds. Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo, pp. 99-132. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 1980 The Tobacco Industry in the Chesapeake Colonies, 1617-1730: An Interpretation. *Research in Economic History* 5:109-177.

- 1977 From Servants to Slaves: The Transformation of the Chesapeake Labor System. *Southern Studies* 16(1):355-390.
- Miller, Joseph C.
1988 *Way of Death: Merchant Capitalism and the Angolan Slave Trade, 1730-1830*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.
- Miller, Henry M.
1978 Pettus and Utopia: A Comparison of the Faunal Remains from Two Late Seventeenth Century Virginia Households. *Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers, 1978, Volume 13*, Stanley South, ed., pp. 158-179.
- Mintz, Sidney W.
1995 Slave Life on Caribbean Sugar Plantations: Some Unanswered Questions. *Slave Cultures and the Cultures of Slavery*, ed. Stephan Palmié, pp. 12-22. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
1974 *Caribbean Transformations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
1969 Slavery and Emergent Capitalism. In *Slavery in the New World: A Reader in Comparative History*, eds. Laura Foner and Eugene D. Genovese, pp. 27-37. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mintz, Sidney W., and Richard Price
1992 *The Birth of African-American Culture: an Anthropological Perspective*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mintz, Steven, and Susan Kellogg
1988 *Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mobley-Tanaka, Jeannette L.
1997 Gender and Ritual Space During the Pithouse to Pueblo Transition: Subterranean Mealing Rooms in the North American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 62(3):437-448.
- Moore, Henrietta L.
1988 *Feminism and Anthropology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morgan, Edmund P.
1975 *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: W.W. Norton.

- Morgan, Lewis Henry
1887 [1995] *Ancient Society*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 1870 *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Morgan, Philip D.
1998 *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 1997 *Sub-Floor Pits and Slavery in 18th and early 19th-Century Virginia*. Paper.
- 1988 Task and Gang Systems: The Organization of Labor on New World Plantations. *Work and Labor in Early America*, ed. Stephen Innes, pp. 189-220. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 1993 Temporal Patterning in House Plans from the 17th-Century Chesapeake. In *The 17th-Century Virginia*, eds. Theodore R. Reinhart and Dennis J.
- Morton, Richard L., ed.
1956 *The Present State of Virginia*. Originally published in 1724 by Hugh Jones. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 1987 Domestic Architecture at the Cliffs Plantation: The Social Context of Early Building. *Northern Neck of Virginia Historical Magazine* 28(1):3096.
- Mouer, L. Daniel
1993 Chesapeake Creoles: The Creation of Folk Culture in Colonial Virginia. In *The Archaeology of 17th-Century Virginia*, eds. Theodore R. Reinhart and Dennis J. Pogue, pp. 167-182. Richmond: Dietz Press.
- 1980a *The Robert E. Lee Memorial Association, Stratford, Virginia*.
- 1991 "Root Cellars" Revisited. *African-American Archaeology* 5:5-6.
- 1980b *The "Manner House" Before Stratford: Discovering the Cliffs Plantation*. A
- Mouer, L. Daniel, Mary Ellen N. Hodges, Stephen R. Potter, Susan L. Henry Renaud, Ivor Noël Hume, Dennis J. Pogue, Martha W. McCartney, and Thomas E. Davidson
1999 Colonoware Pottery, Chesapeake Pipes, and "Uncritical Assumptions." In *I, Too, Am America": Archaeological Studies of African-American Life*, ed. Theresa A. Singleton, pp. 83-115. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- 2000 Electronic document.
- Mullin, Gerald W. <http://monticello.org/archaeology/publications/hemings.pdf>
- 1972 *Flight and Rebellion: Slave Resistance in Eighteenth-Century Virginia*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1988 Household Economics of Scale in Consumption: Theory and Evidence. *The Economic Society, Economica* 56(6):1301-1314. Electronic document.
- Mullin, Michael
1992 *Africa in America: Slave Acculturation and Resistance in the American South and the British Caribbean, 1736-1831*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Murdock, George P.
1949 *Social Structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Scientist 25:641-662.

- Myrdal, Gunnar
 1964 *An American Dilemma, Vol. 2, The Negro Social Structure*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nash, Gary B.
 1989 *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Neiman, Fraser D.
 1997 Sub-Floor Pits and Slavery in 18th and early 19th-Century Virginia. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Corpus Christi, Texas.
 1993 Temporal Patterning in House Plans from the 17th-Century Chesapeake. In *The Archaeology of 17th-Century Virginia*, eds. Theodore R. Reinhart and Dennis J. Pogue, pp. 251-284. Richmond: Dietz Press.
 1987 Domestic Architecture at the Clifts Plantation: The Social Context of Early Virginia Building. *Northern Neck of Virginia Historical Magazine* 28(1):3096-3128.
 1980a Field Archaeology of the Clifts Plantation Site, Westmoreland County, Virginia. The Robert E. Lee Memorial Association, Stratford, Virginia.
 1980b *The "Manner House" Before Stratford: Discovering the Clifts Plantation*. A Stratford Handbook, Stratford, Virginia.
- Neiman, Fraser, Leslie McFaden, and Derek Wheeler
 2000 Archaeological Investigations of the Elizabeth Hemings Site (44AB438). Monticello Department of Archaeology Technical Report Series Number 2. Electronic document, <<http://www.monticello.org/archaeology/publications/hemings.pdf>>
- Nelson, Julie
 1988 Household Economies of Scale in Consumption: Theory and Evidence. The Econometric Society. *Econometrica* 56(6):1301-1314. Electronic document, <http://econpapers.hhs.se/article/ecmemetrp/v_3A56_3Ay_3A1988_3Ai_3A6_3Ap_3A1301-14.htm>
- Netting, Robert McC.
 1982 Some Homes Truths on Household Size and Wealth. *American Behavioral Scientist* 25:641-662.

- Netting, Robert McC., Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould
 1984 Introduction. In *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, eds. Robert McC. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, pp. xiii-xxxviii. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Noël Hume, Ivor
 1970 *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
 1969 *Historical Archaeology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- 1968 *Excavations at Tutter's Neck in James City County, Virginia, 1960-1961*. Contributions from the Museum of History and Technology, Paper 53. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Norton, Mary Beth, Herbert C. Gutman, and Ira Berlin
 1983 The Afro-American Family in the Age of the Revolution. In *Slavery and Freedom*, eds. Ira Berlin and Ronald Hoffman, pp. 175-191. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Nugent, Nell M.
 1979 *Cavaliers and Pioneers: Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants, 1695-1732*. Volume III. Richmond: Virginia State Library.
- Nwokeji, G. Ugo
 2001 African Conceptions of Gender and the Slave Trade. *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, LVIII(1):47-68.
- O'Connell, James F.
 1987 Alyawara Site Structure and Its Archaeological Implications. *American Antiquity* 52(1):74-108.
- Okihiro, Gary Y., ed.
 1986 *In Resistance: Studies in African, Caribbean, and Afro-American History*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
- Oswald, Adrian
 1975 *Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist*. British Archaeological Reports 14. Oxford, England: Truexpress.
- Oszuscik, Philippe
 1992 African-Americans in the American South. In *To Build in a New Land: Ethnic Landscapes in North America*, ed. Allen G. Noble. Pp. 157-176. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Otto, John Solomon
 1984 *Cannon's Point Plantation, 1794-1869: Living Conditions and Status Patterns in the Old South*. Academic Press, Orlando.
- Outlaw, Merry A, Beverly A. Bogley, and Alain C. Outlaw
 1977 Rich Man, Poor Man: Status Definition in Two Seventeenth-Century Ceramic Assemblages from Kingsmill. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology.
- Owens, Leslie Howard
 1976 *This Species of Property: Slave Life and Culture in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary [OED]
 1989 *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Palmié, Stephan
 1995 Introduction. In *Slave Cultures and the Cultures of Slavery*, ed. Stephan Palmié, pp. iv-xlvii. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Paquette, Robert L.
 1991 Slave Resistance and Social History. *Journal of Social History* 24:681-686.
- Parish, Peter J.
 1989 *Slavery: History and Historians*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Parker, Kathleen A. and Jacqueline L. Hernigle
 1990 *Portici: Portrait of a Middling Plantation in Piedmont Virginia*. Occasional Report #3, Regional Archaeology Program, National Capital Region, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Patten, Drake
 1992 Mankala and Minkisi: Possible Evidence of African American Folk Beliefs and Practices. *African American Archaeology* 6:5-7.
- Patterson, Orlando
 1998 *Rituals of Blood: Consequences of Slavery in Two American Centuries*. Washington, D.C.: Civitas Counterpoint.
- 1982 *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Pearce, Laurie

- 1992 The Cowrie Shell in Virginia: A Critical Evaluation of Potential Archaeological Significance. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Pearson, Michael Parker, and Colin Richards, eds.

- 1994 *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space*. London: Routledge.

Peters, Marie Ferguson

- 1988 Parenting in Black Families with Young Children: A Historical Perspective. *Black Families* Second Edition, ed. Harriette Pipes McAdoo, pp. 228-241. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Pettus, Thomas II

- 1691 Inventory of Estate. Henrico County Court Records, Vol. 1 (1650-1717), pp. 73-74.

Pierson, William D.

- 1996 *From Africa to America: African American History from the Colonial Era to the Early Republic, 1526-1790*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Platt, Anthony M.

- 2001 Introduction. In *The Negro Family in the United States*, pp. vii-xxxii. Anthony Platt, ed. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Pogue, Dennis, and Esther White

- 1994 Reanalysis of Features and Artifacts Excavated at George Washington's Birthplace, Virginia. *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia*, 49(1):32-45.

- 1991 Summary Report on the "House for Families" Slave Quarter Site, (44FX762/40-47), Mount Vernon Plantation, Mount Vernon, Virginia. Mount Vernon, Virginia: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

Potkay, Adam, and Sandra Burr, eds.

- 1995 *Black Atlantic Writers of the Eighteenth Century: Living the New Exodus in England and the Americas*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Privy Council Registers

- 1738-1778 Public Records Office, Privy Council Registers, PRO/PC 2/109, Survey Report 6111, pp. 130-135. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Rockefeller Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Pullins, Stephen

- 2001 Notes on Southall's Quarter, 44JC969, James City County, Virginia. Electronic document, <<http://web.wm.edu/wmcar/sq/>>

Pulsipher, Lydia M., and LaVerne Wells-Bowie

- 1989 The Domestic Spaces of Daufuskie and Monserrat: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. In *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Series*, No. 7, pp. 2-28. Berkeley: University of California.

Quarles, Benjamin

- 1969 *The Negro in the Making of America*. New York: Collier-Macmillan. Ltd.

Raboteau, Albert J.

- 1989 Black Religion. In *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, eds. Charles Reagan Wilson and William Ferris, pp. 190-192. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- 1978 *Slave Religion: The "Invisible Institution" in the Antebellum South*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R., and Daryll Forde, eds.

- 1950 *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*. New York: Published for the International African Institute by the Oxford University Press.

Rafferty, Janet

- 1994 Gradual or Step-Wise Change: The Development of Sedentary Settlement Patterns in Northeast Mississippi. *American Antiquity* 59(3):405-425.

Rainwater, Lee, and William L. Yancey, eds.

- 1967 *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press.

Rawick, George P., ed.

- 1972 *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing.

Redfield, Robert, Ralph Linton, and Melville J. Herskovits

- 1936 Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation. *American Anthropologist* 38: 149-52.

Reinhart, Theodore R.

- 1987 Material Culture, Social Relations, and Spatial Organization of a Colonial Frontier: The Pope Site (44SN180), Southampton County, Virginia. Department of Anthropology, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Robertson, Claire

- 1996 Africa into the Americas?: Slavery and Women, the Family, and the Gender Division of Labor. In *More Than Chattel: Black Women and Slavery in the Americas*, eds. David Barry Gaspar and Darlene Clark Hine, pp. 3-40. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Rose, Willie Lee

- 1982 *Slavery and Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryder, Robin L.

- 1991 Free African-American Archeology: Interpreting an Antebellum Farmstead. Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

St. George, Robert Blair

- 1990 Bawns and Beliefs: Architecture, Commerce, and Conversion in Early New England. *Winterthur Portfolio* 25(4):241-287.

Samford, Patricia

- 2000 Power Runs in Many Channels: Subfloor Pits and West African-Based Spiritual Traditions in Colonial Virginia. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina.

- 1999 Strong is the Bond of Kinship: West African Ancestor Shrines and Subfloor Pits on African-American Quarters. In *Historical Archaeology, Identity Formation, and the Interpretation of Ethnicity*, eds. Maria Franklin and Garrett Fesler, pp. 71-91. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Research Publications. Richmond: Dietz Press.

- 1996 The Archaeology of African-American Slavery and Material Culture. *The William and Mary Quarterly* LIII (1):87-114.

Sanford, Douglas W.

- 1994 The Archaeology of Plantation Slavery in Piedmont Virginia. In *Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake*, eds. Paul A. Shackel and Barbara J. Little, pp. 115-130. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

- 1991 A Response to Anne Yentsch's Research Note on Below-Ground "Storage Cellars" Among the Ibo. *African-American Archaeology* 5:4-5.

Schiffer, Michael B.

- 1987 *Formation Processes in the Archaeological Record*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Schillaci, Michael A., and Christopher M. Stojanowski

- 2002 A Reassessment of Matrilocalty in Chacoan Culture. *American Antiquity* 67(2):343-356.

Scholnick, Josh, Derek Wheeler, and Fraser Neiman

- 2001 Mulberry Row Reassessment: The Building I Site. Monticello Department of Archaeology Technical Report Series Number 3. Electronic document, <<http://www.monticello.org/archaeology/publications/buildingI.pdf>>

Schreiber, Katharina J., and Keith W. Kintigh

- 1996 A Test of the Relationship Between Site Size and Population. *American Antiquity* 61(3):573-579.

Schweninger, Loren

- 1975 A Slave Family in the Ante Bellum South. *Journal of Negro History* 60(1):29-44.

Scott, James C.

- 1990 *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Seymour, Deni J., and Michael B. Schiffer

- 1987 A Preliminary Analysis of Pithouse Assemblages from Snaketown, Arizona. In *Method and Theory for Activity Area Research: An Ethnoarchaeological Approach*, ed. Susan Kent, pp. 549-603. New York: Columbia University Press.

Shammas, Carole

- 1985 Black Women's Work and the Evolution of Plantation Society in Virginia. *Labor History* 26(1):5-28.

Shifflett, Crandall A.

- 1975 The Household Composition of Rural Black Families: Louisa County, Virginia, 1880. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* VI:2:235-260.

Singleton, Theresa A.

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

Singleton, Theresa A., and Mark Bograd

- 1995 *The Archaeology of the African Diaspora in the Americas*. Guides to the Archaeological Literature of the Immigrant Experience in America, Number 2. Society for Historical Archaeology. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Braun-Brumfield, Inc.

- Smith, Adam, and Nicholas David
1990 The Production of Space and the House of Xidi Sukur. *Current Anthropology* 36(3):441-471.
- Smyth, John Ferdinand Dalziel
1784 *A Tour in the United States of America*. 2 vols. London: G. Robinson and J. Sewell.
- Sobel, Mechal
1987 *The World They Made Together: Black and White Values in Eighteenth-Century Virginia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- South, Stanley
1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Spain, Daphne
1992 *Gendered Spaces*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Spector, Janet
1983 Male/Female Task Differentiation Among the Hidatsa: Toward the Development of an Archaeological Approach to the Study of Gender. In *The Hidden Half: Studies of Plains Indian Women*, eds. Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine, pp. 77-99. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Sprinkle, John H. Jr.
1991a Charles Cox's Mill Chest: A Documentary Example of Slave Material Culture. *African-American Archaeology* 3:3.
1991b The Contents of Charles Cox's Mill House Chest. *Historical Archaeology* 25(3):91-93.
- Stampp, Kenneth M.
1956 *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-bellum South*. New York: Knopf.
- Staples, Robert
1973 *The Black Woman in America: Sex, Marriage, and the Family*. Chicago: Nelson Hall Publishers.
1971 *The Black Family; Essays and Studies*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Staples, Robert, and Leanor Boulton Johnson
1993 *Black Families at the Crossroads: Challenges and Prospects*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Steady, Filomina Chioma

- 1987 African Feminism: A Worldwide Perspective. In *Women in Africa and the African Diaspora*, eds. Rosalyn Terborg-Penn, Sharon Harley, and Andrea Benton Rushing, pp. 3-24. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Steckel, Richard H.

- 1992 The Slavery Period and its Influence on Family Change in the United States. *Family Systems and Cultural Change*, eds. Elza Berquo and Peter Xenos, pp. 144-158. New York: Clarendon Press.

Stephenson, Mary A.

- 1963 A Record of the Bray Family, 1658-ca. 1800. Ms., Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Rockefeller Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Stevenson, Brenda

- 1996a *Life in Black and White: Family and Community in the Slave South*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- 1996b Gender Convention, Ideals, and Identity Among Antebellum Virginia Slave Women. In *More Than Chattel: Black Women and Slavery in the Americas*, eds. David Barry Gaspar and Darlene Clark Hine, pp. 169-190. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Stevenson, Marc G.

- 1991 Beyond the Formation of Hearth-Associated Artifact Assemblages. In *The Archaeological Interpretations of Spatial Patterns*, eds. Ellen Kroll and T. Douglas Price, pp. 269-300. New York: Plenum Press.

Stewart-Abernathy, Leslie C.

- 1986 Urban Farmsteads: Household Responsibilities in the City. *Historical Archaeology* 20(2):5-15.

Stine, Linda France, Melanie A. Cabak, and Mark D. Groover

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

Stroud, Sarah

- 1999 An Analysis of the Soil Chemistry at the North Hill, Thomas Jefferson's Poplar Forest. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Virginia Academy of Science, Norfolk, Virginia.

Stuckey, Sterling

- 1994 *Going Through the Storm: The Influence of African American Art in History*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sudarkasa, Niara

- 1987 "The Status of Women" in Indigenous African Societies. In *Women in Africa and the African Diaspora*, eds. Rosalyn Terborg-Penn, Sharon Harley, and Andrea Benton Rushing, pp. 25-41. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

- 1980 African and Afro-American Family Structure: A Comparison. *Black Scholar* 11:37-60.

Sutro, Livingston D., and Theodore E. Downing

- 1988 A Step Toward a Grammar of Space: Domestic Space Use in Zapotec Villages. In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, eds. Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, pp. 29-50. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Terborg-Penn, Rosalyn

- 1987 African Feminism: A Theoretical Approach to the History of Women in the African Diaspora. In *Women in Africa and the African Diaspora*, eds. Rosalyn Terborg-Penn, Sharon Harley, and Andrea Benton Rushing, pp. 43-63. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Treckel, Paula A.

- 1996 *To Comfort the Heart: Women in Seventeenth-Century America*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Trigger, Bruce G.

- 1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tringham, Ruth

- 1991 Households with Faces: the Challenge of Gender in Prehistoric Architectural Remains. In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Twombly, Robert

- 1986 *Louis Sullivan: His Life and Work*. New York: Viking Penguin, Inc.

Uchendu, Victor C.

- 1965 *The Igbo of Southeast Nigeria*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

United States Geological Survey

- 1987 Hog Island Quadrangle. On file James River Institute for Archaeology, Williamsburg.

Underhill, Roy

- 1991 *The Woodwright's Eclectic Workshop*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Upton, Dell

- 1990 Imagining the Early Virginia Landscape. In *Earth Patterns*, eds. William M. Kelso and Rachel Most, pp. 71-86. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

- 1988 White and Black Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia. In *Material Life in America, 1600-1860*, ed. Robert St. George, pp. 357-370. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

- 1982 Slave Housing in 18th-Century Virginia: A Report to the Department of Social and Cultural History, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution. Ms. courtesy of the author. On file James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg.

Virginia Magazine of History and Biography

- 1938 Deed Releasing Littleton/Utopia to James Bray XLVI(1):52-55.

Vlach, John Michael

- 1995 "Snug Li'l House with Flue and Oven": Nineteenth-Century Reforms in Plantation Slave Housing. In *Gender, Class, and Shelter: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, V*, eds. Elizabeth Collins Cromley and Carter L. Hudgins, pp. 118-129. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

- 1993 *Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- 1990 *The Afro-American Tradition in the Decorative Arts*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Walker, Ian

- 1977 Clay Tobacco-Pipes, With Particular Reference to the Bristol Industry. In *History and Archaeology* 11a-d, 4 vols. Ottawa: National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, pp. i-xxii, 1-1837.

Walsh, Lorena

- 2001 The Chesapeake Slave Trade: Regional Patterns, African Origins, and Some Implications. *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, LVIII(1):139-170.

- 1997 *From Calabar to Carter's Grove: The History of a Virginia Slave Community*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

- 1993 Slave Life, Slave Society, and Tobacco Production in the Tidewater Chesapeake, 1620-1820. *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas*, eds. Ira Berlin and Phillip D. Morgan, pp. 170-199. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

- 1989 Plantation Management in the Chesapeake, 1620-1820. *The Journal of Economic History*, XLIX (2):393-406.
- Washburn, Wilcomb E.
1957 *The Governor and the Rebel*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wattenmaker, Patricia
1994 Household Economy in Early State Society: Material Value, Productive Context and Spheres of Exchange. In *Economic Anthropology of the State*, ed. Elizabeth Brumfiel, pp. 93-118. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Webb, Stephen Saunders
1984 *1676-The End of American Independence*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Wells, Camille
1993 The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia. *Winterthur Portfolio* 28(1):1-31.
1976 Kingsmill Plantation: A Cultural Analysis. Master's thesis, School of Architecture, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Westmacott, Richard
1992 *African American Gardens and Yards in the Rural South*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Wheaton, Thomas R., Amy Friedlander, and Patrick H. Garrow
1983 Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations: Studies in Afro-American Archaeology. Soil Systems, Inc., Marietta, Georgia.
- White, Deborah Gray.
1985 *Ar'n't I a Woman? Female Slaves in the Plantation South*. New York: Norton.
- Wilk, Richard R.
1990 The Built Environment and Consumer Decisions. In *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space*, ed. Susan Kent, pp. 34-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1988 Maya Household Organization: Evidence and Analogies. In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, eds. Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, pp. 135-151. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- 1984 Households in Process: Agricultural Change and Domestic Transformation among the Kekchi Maya of Belize. In *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, eds. Robert McC. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, pp. 217-244. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1983 Little Houses in the Jungle: The Causes of Variation in House Size among Modern Kekchi Maya. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 2:99-116.
- Wilk, Richard R. and William Rathje
1982 Household Archaeology. *American Behavioral Scientist* 23(6):617-639.
- Wilk, Richard R., and Robert McC. Netting
1984 Households: Changing Forms and Functions. *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, eds. Robert McC. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, pp. 1-28. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Willis, Anne R.
1995 The Masters' Mercy: Slave Prosecutions and Punishments in York County, Virginia, 1700-1780. Master's thesis, Department of American Studies, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Winfree, Waverly K., ed.
1971 *The Laws of Virginia; being a Supplement to Hening's the Statutes at Large, 1700-1750*. Richmond: Virginia State Library.
- Winter, Marcus C.
1976 The Archaeological Household Cluster in the Valley of Oaxaca. *The Early Mesoamerican Village*, ed. Kent Flannery, pp. 25-34. New York: Academic Press.
- Wood, Margaret Clare
2002 Fighting for our Homes: Archaeology and the Transformation of Women's Domestic Labor in a Coal Mining Community, 1900-1930. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Syracuse University, Syracuse.
- Wood, Peter H.
1974 *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Woodfin, Maude H., and Marion Tinling, eds.
1942 *Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1739-1741, with Letters & Literary Exercises, 1696-1726*. Richmond: Dietz Press

Wright, Louis B., and Marion Tinling, eds.

1941 *The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712*. Richmond: Dietz Press.

1958 *William Byrd of Virginia: The London Diary (1717-1721) and Other Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram

1988 The Mask of Obedience: Male Slave Psychology in the Old South. *American Historical Review* 93(5):1228-1252.

Yanagisako, Sylvia Junko

1979 Family and Household: The Analysis of Domestic Groups. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8:161-205.

Yentsch, Anne E.

1994 *A Chesapeake Family and Their Slaves: A Study in Historical Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1991a Chesapeake Artefacts and their Cultural Context: Pottery and the Food Domain. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 25:25-72.

1991b A Note on a 19th-Century Description of Below-Ground "Storage Cellars" Among the Ibo. *African-American Archaeology* 4:3-4.

1990 Minimum Vessel Lists as Evidence of Change in Folk and Courtly Traditions of Food Use. *Historical Archaeology* 24(3):26-48.