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Preliminary Archaeological and Historical Investigations at Saragossa Plantation, Natchez, Mississippi

Amy L. Young

Abstract

Archaeological, historical, and ethnographic investigations were conducted at Saragossa (22-Ad-984), an antebellum cotton plantation in the Natchez District of Mississippi. This preliminary work has demonstrated the tremendous potential of this site to provide information about everyday life for slaves in this region. Saragossa possesses intact archaeological deposits with excellent preservation of faunal and botanical remains, a standing slave house, and a descendent community. Even though research at Saragossa is in the initial stages, a picture of slave life on this plantation is emerging. The first year of fieldwork has yielded information about housing, diet, and other material conditions. Archaeological investigations have shown that the houses were rather Spartan, and that slaves mainly subsisted on rations in the form of pork, but had opportunities for hunting and fishing to supplement their diet. Future research is planned at Saragossa to provide more details of slave lifeways on this plantation in the Natchez District.

Introduction

For many contemporary Americans, just the word Mississippi conjures up images of black slaves in cotton fields and white columned mansions. An area in the South that contained dense populations of slaves and many extraordinarily wealthy planters is the Natchez District in Mississippi (Davis 1994; Singleton 1991). Because slaves left few or no documents, the archaeological record must provide data about everyday life for the majority of enslaved African Americans. Given the importance of cotton, the dense slave population, and the large number of plantation sites around Natchez, it is ironic that no such archaeological investigations have been conducted. To fill this critical gap in our knowledge, the University of Southern Mississippi Department of Anthropology and Sociology conducted preliminary
archaeological, historical, and ethnographic work at Saragossa Plantation (22-Ad-984), located about four miles south of Natchez (Figure 1). Three weeks of fieldwork there in the summer of 1997 highlighted significant

components that make it ideal for intensive investigation:
1. Intact archaeological deposits with preserved floral and faunal remains;
2. Standing ante-bellum structures including a slave house;
3. A black community descended from Saragossa slaves willing to share information about their culture and history.

Research at Saragossa has the potential to provide answers to many questions concerning aspects of everyday life for slaves on a cotton plantation in the quintessential slave state of Mississippi.

The archaeology of African-American slaves and slavery is becoming an increasingly prominent endeavor within our discipline (e.g. Ferguson 1992; Orser 1994; Samford 1996; Singleton 1995; Singleton and Bograd 1995; Young 1995). Archaeology of African-American sites is in some ways different from that conducted at famous historical sites or homes of wealthy and powerful white Americans like George Washington. Not only are the places where slaves lived and worked different from those occupied by their white owners, but what we know of their everyday lives and how we know it is also different. Many famous white Americans were wealthy and powerful and built large, substantial homes like Thomas Jefferson's Monticello and George Washington's Mount Vernon. Houses like Monticello have been carefully analyzed and reanalyzed by architectural historians, and when this information is combined with intensive historical and archaeological research we can learn a great deal about the builder and the house's occupants. Conversely, most slave houses were small, poorly constructed, and have long since vanished from the modern landscape. A few that survived have been recently studied (Vlach 1990:122–138, 1993:153–182), but these may have been built relatively late, or may have been more sturdy than average so are not truly representative. Many slave house remains, however, lie buried in the archaeological record and await investigation.

Like the houses of slaves and slave owners, the documentary record concerning these two groups of people is different. The literacy (as well as the political influence and wealth) of prominent white Americans meant that they wrote many documents about themselves, a significant portion of which survive today. However, few African-American slaves left such written records. With the exception of extraordinary individuals who managed to escape to freedom and publish accounts of their lives under slavery, most of the documents concerning slave life were written by wealthy whites. Often they were
slave owners who had an agenda, trying to justify the institution either consciously or unconsciously. This makes the information in the documents somewhat suspect. It is extremely unlikely that black slaves would have written the same things about their enslavement that their owners wrote. Archaeology on plantations and other sites associated with African Americans can give us another, more democratic source of information about the past; information that is not found in the documents (Ferguson 1992).

Most archaeological research concerning the African-American experience under slavery has been conducted on South Carolina and Georgia rice plantations and on tobacco plantations in the Chesapeake and Piedmont of Virginia (Adams and Boling 1989; Ferguson 1992; Joseph 1989; Kelso 1986; Lewis 1985; McKee 1992; Otto 1984; Reitz et al. 1985; Wheaton and Garrow 1985). An extensive database is also developing for the Upland South, where there were no traditional plantations or crops like cotton, and slaves comprised the minority of the total population (e.g., Young 1995, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c). Through archaeological and historical research, a great deal of information is known concerning slave and planter life in these particular regions of the South.

Archaeological investigations have contributed new insights into slave housing, diet, clothing, personal possessions, and many other aspects of daily life. For example, the work of Tom Wheaton and Pat Garrow at the South Carolina plantations of Yaughan and Curriboo demonstrates that slaves there lived in houses that looked very much like those in West Africa and Haiti (Wheaton and Garrow 1985). Built of poles in the ground, woven with branches and plastered with mud, the sizes and shapes of the houses at Yaughan and Curriboo, along with the method of construction, are similar to those still built today in parts of West Africa. Wheaton and Garrow (1985) also show that the slaves manufactured many of their own ceramics: a low-fired, hand built earthenware called colonoware. Further, they made their pots in the form of West African vessels. In Virginia, a different picture of slave life is emerging. Deetz (1988) discusses how the Virginia slaves made colonoware vessels that resemble English-made ceramics, including teapots, chamber pots, and pipkins. Slave housing in Virginia looked much like the housing for Anglo-Virginians, but smaller. My work in Kentucky has shown that there is nothing distinctively African about the slave housing in the Upland South, where no colonoware has been recovered (Young 1995).

Diets of African-American slaves all along the Atlantic seaboard, as revealed in the archaeological record, show a significant use of wild species, especially fish (Crader 1990; Lev-Tov and Young 1996; Young 1997a, 1997b). Evidently there was not a heavy dependence on rations for slaves along the Atlantic seaboard. Slaves in other parts of the South, like Kentucky, primarily subsisted on pork (Young 1997a), probably in the form of weekly rations. This brief summary shows that a great deal of significant information has been collected concerning the everyday lives of slaves in the Tidewater and Piedmont of Virginia, the Carolina and Georgia Lowcountry, and the Upland South in Kentucky. Interestingly, these data demonstrate that the institution of slavery was not monolithic and that variability is to be expected in the daily lives of slaves across the South.

The Natchez District consists of several Mississippi counties surrounding Natchez, as well as Concordia Parish in Louisiana. This very small district contained some of the wealthiest plantations in the entire South (Davis 1994). Planters owning hundreds of slaves and numerous plantations made their fortunes raising cotton in Mississippi and sugar in Louisiana. In 1860, approximately seventy percent of the farmers in Adams County owned over fifty slaves (Singleton 1991). Slavery in the Natchez District has a long history, but it was not until the nineteenth century, with improvements in the cotton gin, that slavery became so pervasive and important. Investigation of slaves and slavery in the Natchez District has potential to provide much-needed data for comparison to the Atlantic seaboard and the Upland South. In this way, we can come to a more complete understanding of the full spectrum of the African-American experience under slavery.

Saragossa Plantation

Saragossa is located a few miles south of Natchez in Adams County in the Natchez District. The plantation was established by Stephen Duncan around 1820. Its inception coincides with the growing importance of cotton in the Natchez District. Duncan was one of the wealthiest planters in the South. He owned over a thousand slaves and eight plantations in the Natchez District. The Adams County deed records show that he purchased 1000 arps of land from Jonathan Thompson in 1823. In 1850, Duncan

1 Jonathan Thompson and wife to Stephen Duncan, 1000 arps of land, May 4, 1823. Deed Book N, p. 206, Adams County, Mississippi.
was the largest cotton producer and slaveholder in the world. He is referred to as one of the Natchez "nabobs," the very wealthy, slave-owning elite (Sansing et al. 1992:88–90).

Duncan and his family did not live at Saragossa. Rather, he resided at Auburn, one of the numerous elegant suburban estates that surrounded the town of Natchez. He, and many planters like him, enjoyed suburban living away from the toil of the plantation, maintaining a small retinue of slaves (usually around twenty) in easy proximity to the comfort and culture found in the town of Natchez. An overseer lived at Saragossa and managed the slaves and property for Duncan (Sansing et al. 1992).

The next Saragossa planter was William St. John Elliot. Elliot purchased Saragossa on January 6, 1835 from Duncan. Elliot was also a very wealthy Natchez planter who resided at D’Evereaux, another elegant suburban estate. Elliot owned several plantations, and like Duncan, retained an overseer to run Saragossa (Sansing et al. 1992:90–93).

Elliot sold Saragossa to William G. Conner in December 1849, but Conner sold it back to Elliot in April 1852. Later that same year, Elliot sold Saragossa to Winfield Gibson. Gibson sold the property to Caroline Williams in 1855, and Caroline sold the property to her daughter Anna Smith for $1.00 that same day.

Anna Williams Smith was the wife of Walton Smith, who was the Saragossa planter until his death in 1866. The Saragossa big house was held and occupied by direct descendants of Walton Smith until the 1970s, when it was sold out of the family. Some of these descendants still live in Natchez and have provided much useful and interesting information about the plantation. Unlike the absentee planters Duncan and Elliot, Walton Smith lived at Saragossa and renovated and enlarged the overseer’s house for himself and his family.

During the summer of 1997, I and my field school students began to examine surviving documents, interview descendants, and conduct archaeological testing of Saragossa Plantation. The purpose was to assess the research potential of this important cotton plantation. This preliminary work has provided information concerning housing and some of the material conditions of the Saragossa slaves as well as formulating questions for future research. One ultimate goal is to reconstruct how African Americans at Saragossa managed the many risks faced in their everyday lives under the brutal institution of slavery (Young 1997c).

One of the first questions to be addressed concerning slave life at Saragossa is the size of the black population and the kind of houses they inhabited. Because the tax lists and slave schedules of the United States census simply enumerate all slaves for each owner regardless of where the slaves lived, it is impossible to determine from existing documents precisely how many slaves were at Saragossa when Duncan or Elliot owned the property. It is, however, possible to estimate the size of the slave population between 1823 and 1849 based on the number of slave houses there.

The 1849 deed from William St. John Elliot to William Conner contains a map that shows the location of the Saragossa overseer’s house and eight slave houses arranged in two rows behind the big house (Figure 2). This map was reputedly copied from one drawn in the 1820s when Duncan owned Saragossa. Today, there are two original buildings still standing at Saragossa—the overseer’s house and one double-pen slave house.

The standing slave house is a timber-frame structure that measures roughly thirty by eighteen feet. Mortise and tenon joinery is used in the major structural supports, but nails are used to attach siding and roofing. The floors are wood plank with spaces showing between the planks. The structure has a central brick chimney and rests on brick pier supports. It, and likely all the major dwellings on the plantation, was built into the side

---

2 Stephen Duncan to William St. John Elliot, Deed Book V, p. 490, Jan 6, 1835, Adams County, Mississippi. This is the first reference to the property as Saragossa.
4 William Conner to William St. John Elliot, Deed Book HH, p. 177, April 26, 1852, Adams County, Mississippi.
6 Winfield Gibson to Caroline M. Williams, Deed Book KK, p. 312, Jan. 13, 1855, Adams County, Mississippi. Caroline M. Williams to Anna Smith, Deed Book KK, p. 440, Jan. 13, 1855, Adams County, Mississippi.
of the same knoll as the overseer’s house. Like the big house, the standing slave house has been modernized. It has glazed windows, and the interior was plastered. In the 1920s, one room served as the living quarters for a school teacher who taught the Smith children in the other room of the house.

Typically, these double-pen slave houses were duplexes. A single slave family resided in each room. This suggests that there were sixteen slave families at Saragossa. Other studies have suggested that slave families in the Natchez District consisted of four to six individuals (Davis 1994); this means that the total slave population at Saragossa probably ranged between sixty-

five and ninety people while Duncan and Elliot were masters of the property.

Walton Smith was listed in the 1860 Adams County census. The slave schedule shows that he owned twenty-four slaves and six slave houses. It appears that the slave population at Saragossa was significantly smaller during the Smith tenure.

Other initial questions we had about Saragossa were: 1) how well preserved were the archaeological deposits relating to the antebellum period; 2) was animal bone well preserved; 3) were there any intact foundations of the slave cabins; 4) had the area been plowed; and 5) what were the basic material conditions under which the slaves lived? To answer these questions, we placed twenty one-by-one meter tests in the area where the slave houses once stood. These units were excavated with shovels and trowels in five-centimeter levels (unless natural stratigraphy was evident). All of the soil was screened through quarter-inch mesh.

A permanent datum point, a piece of PVC pipe, was set into the ground six meters south of the southwest corner of the standing slave house. The grid was aligned with the standing slave house and big house. From the datum point, a line of eleven units was placed along what was the west slave row. Eight one-by-one meter units were placed along the east row of slave houses. A single unit was placed in what would have been the common area between the two rows of slave houses. The Saragossa structures, the datum point, and the unit placement are shown in Figure 3.

Unfortunately, it appears that the area of the west slave row was damaged by plowing. Nevertheless, quite a bit of material, especially ceramics and bottle glass, was recovered. This represents objects owned and used by Saragossa slaves. Brick, metal, and animal bone were not well preserved in this area. The ceramics are typical of nineteenth-century occupation and consist primarily of whiteware and some pearlware. The most prevalent decorative type is blue shell edge, most of which is embossed and scalloped, indicating an antebellum date of manufacture (Ward 1996). Wine bottle

* 1860 Adams County, Mississippi, slave schedule. Microfilm roll 595, Cook Library, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg. Presumably the houses were six of the eight "duplexes" used previously.
glass was recovered in large quantities in Units 1–11. This may indicate that slaves had access to alcoholic beverages, or it may represent reuse of bottles. Most of the artifacts that were recovered from Units 1–11 were fairly small, typical of plowed contexts.

Very little window glass and no plaster were recovered from the eleven units placed along the west slave row. This tells us that the original slave houses were not plastered, nor were glazed windows common. It appears that the original cabins provided a Spartan existence for the slaves. They were rough wooden structures, with shutters and no glass in windows. The houses must have been rather dark in the winter when the shutters were closed against the cold.

Eight units were placed along the east slave row. In this case, we tested two west row houses: the second house away from the big house and the last house on that row.

Based on oral history, the second house on the east slave row was still standing into the 1920s and was occupied by a former slave named Caroline Burks, born around 1849. Also according to interviews with Smith family members who have first-hand knowledge of this woman, Ms. Burks remained on the plantation after freedom. In the first two decades of the twentieth century, Ms. Burks served as the mammy for the Smith children who were interviewed during the project. Ms. Burks cooked biscuits for the children and would sit in her cabin at a small table where she would cut pieces from twists of tobacco to smoke in her clay pipes. Incidentally, the table where she cut tobacco, once partially burned and now heavily repaired, is owned by one of the Smith descendants.

Five one-by-one meter units were used to investigate Caroline Burks’ house. The archaeological testing shows that the brick piers and the chimney foundation were removed. Evidently most of the brick was scavenged and used elsewhere on the property. This activity during the later twentieth century may have erased traces of the foundation piers. The robbed pit where the chimney stood was discovered, however. Ironically, Caroline Burks’ fireplace was placed directly in a Mississippian-aged feature, a pit, filled with numerous sherds of Piaquemine Brushed and other types of Mississippian pottery. Figure 4 shows the location of these two superimposed features in the excavation unit. Very little window glass was recovered from Caroline Burks’ house, suggesting that her windows were shuttered rather than glazed. Even a favored servant lived a very simple existence at Saragossa in the 1920s. An early fencepost hole was found and excavated at the corner of where Ms. Burks’ porch would have stood. Perhaps a fence separated the rear cabin yard from the front. Artifacts recovered from Caroline Burks’ house include transfer-printed and blue shell edge ceramics, bottle glass, nails and nail fragments, brick fragments, and several clay tobacco pipe fragments.
Three additional one-by-one meter units were placed in or near the last house on the east slave row, named by the field school students “The Fourth House.” Not only was this the fourth house on the row, but we began excavations on the Fourth of July.

The test excavations revealed over thirty centimeters of well stratified deposits. The lowest stratum consists of very dense concentrations of brick fragments and appears to represent debris from when the house was originally constructed. Above that are strata laid down while the house was occupied, and these were capped with deposits that also consist of heavier concentrations of brick fragments and nails that relate to the destruction of the house. In addition to architectural artifacts, ceramics and some bottle glass were recovered, giving us some more information concerning the material possessions of the Saragossa slaves. Also at the Fourth House, animal bone was very well preserved.

Michael Tuma, a USM graduate student, identified the faunal remains. The assemblage mainly consists of pig, and quite a bit of these bones are mandible and forelimbs, which may represent rations. However, there is a significant amount of wild fauna, which indicates hunting, trapping, and fishing. This evidence suggests that the slaves at Saragossa worked in a task system.

There were two primary ways that slave labor was organized in the South. One was the gang system, where large groups or gangs of slaves worked from sunup to sundown under the direction of an overseer or driver (Young 1997a). Slaves had little free time, usually only Sundays. This would have made hunting and fishing difficult. The other way to organize slave labor, which became increasingly popular as the nineteenth century progressed, is the task system. In the task system, each slave was assigned a daily task, and when that task was done, no more work was required by the master. Tasks were meant to take most of the day, but slaves could sometimes manage to finish their task early and have “free” time for socializing, hunting, fishing, working in gardens, or making crafts to sell in town. Perhaps the wild fauna remains at Saragossa indicate that the slaves had some time for themselves and spent some of this time hunting and fishing to supplement their diet. The sample of animal bones is quite small, however, so these interpretations are tentative.

A single unit, Unit 19, was placed in the area between the two rows of slave houses. Informants told us that part of this area was a garden in the twentieth century, but we hoped to find an undisturbed portion of what may have been the common domestic work area in the slave community. Therefore, we placed the unit directly beneath an old pecan tree, hoping that the area had not been plowed. Domestic materials dating to the antebellum period were recovered from Unit 19 to a depth of eighteen centimeters. No subsurface features were discovered. The excavation of this unit suggests that the area around the pecan tree has not been plowed. There may be a portion of the common yard that will yield undisturbed features reflecting activities like outdoor cooking.
The archaeological work at Saragossa is beginning to provide information about life for slaves on a Mississippi cotton plantation. We now know more details of slave housing on a cotton plantation—that wild fauna were included in the diet and slaves had access to tobacco and possibly to alcoholic beverages. Another significant avenue of research is collecting ethnographic data from the slave descendent community.

During the field school, graduate student Michael Tuma began to find out about the importance of hunting in the Saragossa descendent community. In the fall he received a small Sigma Xi grant to investigate hunting in this community in order interpret the animal bone at Saragossa and reconstruct slave subsistence there.

For at least part of the year, hunting provides a large portion of the diet in the modern Saragossa community. Men hunt using a variety of techniques. The hunting territory includes the seventy-five-acre remnant Saragossa Plantation. Prey includes white tailed deer, raccoon, and feral pig. The animals are brought back to the community to a small hunting lodge or camp erected by the men in the neighborhood. Large animals such as deer and feral pig are butchered and the parts of the animal distributed among the hunters and their kin. The heads and feet are usually tossed in a ravine behind the hunting lodge. Some of the meat is frozen for later use. Often, after a successful hunt, a feast or party takes place, with most everyone in the community invited to share. This party or feast occurs at the end of a lane in a large cleared common area.

The residents of the descendent community are poor. Some live in houses that are no more than wood shacks, some live in better-constructed homes. Most of the residents of the community are related to each other by blood and marriage, and Mr. Tuma is still investigating the role of kinship in the area, especially as it relates to the movement of meat and material possessions.

While excavating at Saragossa, we drove through the neighborhood each day and noticed that quite a bit of activity occurs outside the houses. Trash is burned, laundry is done, and socializing and other activities take place. The large communal area where parties are held often has a lot of trash, but this area is periodically raked or swept to get rid of the debris. We hope to examine systematically how yards and the common area are used and cleaned to see if there is any correlation with the archaeological remains around the slave houses.

Conclusions

Archaeological investigations of plantation sites in the Lowcountry of Georgia and South Carolina (Adams and Boling 1989; Ferguson 1992; Joseph 1989; Otto 1984; Wheaton and Garrow 1985), the Chesapeake and Piedmont of Virginia (Kelso 1986; McKee 1992; Deetz 1988), and in the Upland South in Kentucky (Young 1995, 1996) have yielded significant information concerning aspects of everyday life for slaves in these regions of the South. Because of archaeological data, we now know more about housing, diet, and other material conditions of slaves who raised rice in the Carolina Lowcountry, tobacco in Virginia, and hogs and corn in the Upland South. It is ironic to think that no archaeological investigations have been conducted on antebellum cotton plantations in Mississippi, since many Americans equate slavery with Mississippi cotton. Without such data, a very large part of the slave experience in the American South is undocumented. It is critical that such investigations be conducted in the Natchez District and in the Mississippi Delta if we are to understand the full range of the African-American experience under slavery.

Saragossa—the plantation and the modern descendent community—is ideal for gaining information about black culture and history in the Natchez District. The wealth and the very large slave populations make the Natchez District roughly comparable to the region around Charleston in the rice-growing Lowcountry. Information gleaned through archaeological investigations in the Natchez District is providing an excellent database to compare with the Lowcountry plantation excavations.

The initial investigations at Saragossa have shown that the slave housing was rather simple, consisting of double-pen timber frame structures with wood plank floors and central brick chimneys. A single slave family consisting of between four and six individuals would have lived in each room or pen. The houses did not originally have glazed windows. Based on the relatively high frequencies of wine bottle glass and tobacco pipe fragments, it appears that the slaves had access to alcohol and tobacco. Animal protein in the diet came primarily from pigs, and the faunal assemblage suggests that the slaves received rations. A small but significant portion of the faunal assemblage, however, consisted of wild species, suggesting that the slaves had some free time to hunt and fish and that labor at Saragossa was organ-
nized under the task system. Preliminary results such as these justify a plan of research at Saragossa and at other sites in the Natchez District lasting many years.

In May 1989, Dr. Theresa Singleton from the Smithsonian Institution helped organize a symposium, “Digging the Afro-American Past and Archaeology of the Black Experience,” at Oxford, Mississippi. One result of that ground-breaking conference was a paper by Singleton published in Mississippi Archaeology in 1991, assessing the potential for the archaeology of slavery and other African-American sites in this state. Though it has taken nearly a decade to take the first steps toward realizing this potential, it is obvious that the archaeological record of African Americans in Mississippi will reveal much valuable new evidence.

Amy L. Young is an assistant professor in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of Southern Mississippi.
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"Some Eight or Ten Miserable Tenements":
Archaeological Investigations at Old Augusta, Perry County, Mississippi

Amy L. Young and R. Steven Kidd

Abstract

The 1997 University of Southern Mississippi summer archaeological field school spent two weeks conducting limited testing at Old Augusta (22-Pe-1605), a nineteenth-century community in the Pine Hills. The purpose was to discover the degree of preservation and locations of structures, as well as to assess the research potential of this site. No early standing structures remain today at Old Augusta, and the community was virtually abandoned by the 1920s. Fifteen one-by-one meter units were used to explore the portion of Old Augusta that lies on the Pat Harrison Waterways District property in Perry County, Mississippi. The archaeological remains of five structures were located: three public buildings, a private dwelling, and one unidentified structure. While some looting and brick scavenging has occurred on the property, much remains intact for addressing questions of daily activities that took place in and around these buildings.

Historical Background

Old Augusta was originally known as Augusta. It is located in present-day Perry County, Mississippi, on the Leaf River (Figure 1). Old Augusta was one of the earliest Euroamerican communities in the interior of southern Mississippi, founded while it was still Indian (Choctaw) Territory. Initial settlement may have begun with the opening of the Government Land Office at Augusta in 1812 to record property sales. When Perry County was established in 1819, Augusta became the county seat. According to historians who nominated Old Augusta for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the town served as a center of government and a commercial hub. Evidently the place where Augusta was established was the highest point on the Leaf River from which flatboats could navigate (Adkins 1972). People in the area would bring to Augusta their produce (logs or farm prod-
ucts), which would then be floated downriver to Mobile, Alabama. Manufactured goods were brought overland from Mobile back to Augusta. Oral tradition holds that Augusta was a slave trading center between Mobile and Natchez or New Orleans and that slaves were auctioned on a block in front of the Old Augusta Courthouse. While Pitts (1909) mentions slave trading in his account of the confession of James Copeland, the paucity of documentary evidence concerning this and many other aspects of events and daily life at Old Augusta means that the only data concerning slave trading and other traditions comes from the archaeological and oral historical records.

A series of courthouse fires destroyed many of the important records of Old Augusta, leaving us with a shroud of mystery and some folklore about this historic Pine Hills community. An examination of federal census records and Perry County tax rolls shows that the population of the town was quite small (considerably less than five hundred) from the 1820s until 1870 (United States Bureau of Census [USBC] 1820, 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880) (Table 1). We know from scant documents prior to the Civil War that there was a jail, a courthouse, at least one general store, a Methodist church, and several residences within the boundaries of what was considered Old Augusta.

 Augusta had begun to decline prior to the Civil War when new, better agricultural land opened beyond the Pine Hills (Adkins 1972). The Government Land Office was moved to Paulding, Mississippi, in 1860, marking the "diminishing importance of Old Augusta" (Wright 1981:4). One description that clearly illustrates that decline was by John Claiborne (1906), who traveled through the area in the 1840s. He wrote:

[Augusta consisted of] some eight or ten miserable tenements...Scarce a tree stood in the gaping square for the eye to rest upon; the grass was all withered up...Even of these dilapidated dwellings several were unoccupied, and we rode round half the town before we could find a living thing to direct us to the tavern. We finally reached it and found it "alone in its glory," a small log cabin with one room and a shed. Stable there was none, nor bar, nor landlord, nor barkeeper.

This description of Old Augusta suggests that the decline of the community was well underway by the 1840s when Claiborne made his trip through the Piney Woods. Another study stated that in 1852 Old Augusta contained only a church, a school, a post office, the land office and seven families (Moore 1956).

In 1898, when the railroad came through the vicinity, many who remained began to abandon the community, by moving to New Augusta to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
<th>Value of lots</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Hyde</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$2000 merchandise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Howze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. H. Holliman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Joiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. McSwain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Wheeler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be closer to this critical transportation network. Local residents of Perry County have suggested that the few who remained in Old Augusta after 1900 were eventually devastated by the Great Depression. Elderly citizens of New Augusta remembered that Old Augusta, around the turn of the century, had contained the Kennedy Brothers' Store, Ben Stevens' General Store, a drug store, a soda fountain, Dearman's blacksmith, a barber shop, a courthouse, a jail, and three churches.1

Examination of the U.S. censuses (USBC 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880) for Perry County shows that most of the residents in and around Old Augusta were farmers. The Pine Hills region of southern Mississippi was characterized by small farms specializing in cattle. The soils in the Pine Hills are generally poor, except along river floodplains. Farmers raised enough corn, rice, potatoes, and beans for themselves, their slaves, and their livestock (Napier 1986). The natural vegetation of the area was plentiful and good for grazing cattle. The farmers practiced open grazing, which meant that large herds could be raised with little labor and little or no supplemental feeding (Napier 1986:18; McWhiney 1986:44).

Napier (1986:18) suggests that timbering and turpentine became important in the Pine Hills region largely after the Civil War. Huge southern long leaf yellow pine trees were felled and floated down the Leaf, Pearl, and Pascagoula rivers to various early lumber mills on the Gulf Coast.

The most famous event at Old Augusta was the trial and subsequent hanging of the infamous outlaw James Copeland. Copeland was held in the jail at Augusta for two years before his trial (Pitts 1909:125). Legends abound concerning gold or other money that modern residents believe he buried in the vicinity of Old Augusta. Copeland was hanged in 1858 in the town of Old Augusta. Although the exact site of the hanging is unknown, Pitts, the sheriff of Perry County who recorded Copeland's confession, describes the site of the gallows as one-quarter mile from Augusta (Pitts 1909:134).

There is no indication that the town of Augusta was laid off in a traditional grid of streets as was Natchez. Rather, the town apparently consisted of scattered structures at a crossroads near the Leaf River. The actual boundaries of the town are unknown. Although Old Augusta is called a town, it is probably best referred to as a community, because it was not incorporated, it lacked precise boundaries, and it had a very low population density.

Given the rich history and lore associated with Old Augusta and the fact that the site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, it is somewhat astounding that no archaeological work has been conducted specifically to research this significant community. In the early 1980s, when the Leaf River Pulp Mill (now Georgia Pacific) was planned near the site of Old Augusta, a limited archaeological survey located two sites. They are both aboriginal and located on the north side of the Leaf River. One is southwest of the Pat Harrison Waterways District property. The other is located northeast of the area that the 1997 summer field school tested (Young and Kidd 1998:7–8).

The lack of archaeological investigations at Old Augusta is likely due to a shortage of historical archaeologists in Mississippi who have the professional training to investigate early processes of urbanization. This problem is not confined to our state. Studies of cities and community processes are only recently becoming prominent in historical archaeology in the Southeast, as we are only now becoming aware of the potential of the archaeological record of urban and urbanizing sites as small as Old Augusta and as large as New Orleans (Young 1998a and b). Another reason Old Augusta has not received the attention of archaeologists in the state is the mistaken belief that such “late” sites (after 1840—which applies to most of Old Augusta) have little information to offer that is not found in the documentary record. In fact, many “late” sites that have extensive documentary records still lack data that pertains to the questions posed by anthropologists.

The approximate location of some of the nineteenth-century buildings was recorded when Old Augusta was nominated for listing on the National

1 Microfilm of "The History of Perry County" compiled by WPA workers, found in Cook Library, University of Southern Mississippi, is a typed, unedited manuscript that contains some oral history recorded in the 1930s about Old Augusta in the nineteenth century. For example, Mrs. Bettie Myers was interviewed by WPA writers and asked about Old Augusta. Mrs. Myers had lived either in New Augusta or Augusta for seventy-six years when interviewed. She mentioned an area of Augusta known as the "Quarters" in the late 1860s: "The houses of slaves or 'Quarters' as we termed them, were here, thick oak bushes all around and plenty colored [sic] people still here to wait on their old friends and owners." She also stated that "we had only one church house for all denominations as there were few saw mills in the county and lumber for fences were hard to get, even when the logs could be put up for walls." Unfortunately this and other oral histories recorded in the WPA Perry County history are rambling and imprecise.
Register of Historic Places in 1977. The map was constructed based largely on interviews of elderly residents in Perry County. This map was the basis for our limited testing of the portion of Old Augusta that is owned and controlled by the Pat Harrison Waterways District. This map was also an aid to the identification of the function of the structures that were uncovered in our excavation.

Apparently, Augusta was a community that served as a trading hub for goods and slaves between Mobile and Natchez. Merchants, taverns, stables, churches, and other establishments existed in the community from a relatively early date. In addition, a number of important governmental buildings stood in the center of the community. These include the famous Old Augusta Jail and the courthouse. Even though the population was quite low, the community played an active role in the economic and political development of the Pine Hills region. Traffic between the residents of the Pine Hills and Mobile was crucial to the survival of the early pioneers because of their dependence on commodities not produced locally. Other studies have demonstrated that most small frontier communities were the forerunners of the pioneer farmsteads (Young 1998c; Perkins 1991).

Because Old Augusta served as a commercial and governmental center for Pine Hills residents, its archaeological record offers an opportunity to investigate myriad anthropological questions. One set of questions involves simple reconstructions of the past. What did an antebellum general store look like, and what goods did it carry? What was life like for citizens of Augusta? What kind of informal political activities occurred within the courthouse that are not documented in written records, but may be reflected in the materials discarded in and around a courthouse? Reflect on how modern politicians make decisions by assembling in informal groups, drinks in hand, and reaching a consensus before entering the formal policy-making situation. Further, in the case of Old Augusta specifically, there is very little documentary information concerning the everyday existence of its residents within their homes. Historical archaeologists want to know what people ate, how they used their yards, how people fit into the social and economic hierarchy of the community, and generally what life was like for our recent cultural forebears. Our fieldwork at Old Augusta uncovered sites of public buildings and a private residence that contain valuable data that begin to answer these and many other questions.

Archaeological Investigations

The archaeological testing strategy at Old Augusta was conducted in a series of steps. The first step was to survey the area visually and mark depressions, concentrations of brick, or other historic materials within the Pat Harrison Waterways District. This area is thought to contain the center of the community of Old Augusta. The area of the Pat Harrison Waterways District that was once Old Augusta is presently covered with secondary forest growth, in places quite dense. Visibility was a problem in some areas, so it is likely that not all depressions and concentrations of brick were found during the survey.

Five areas that showed evidence of structures were flagged for further investigation. Figure 2 shows these areas, as well as the location of the primary datum point established at the northwest corner of the cement boat

Figure 2. Map of Old Augusta.
brick wall had been robbed. Three units (Units 4, 5, and 8) were placed in the vicinity of the jail.

Based on informant data, the front of the jail was the east wall, and the early photograph that may date ca. 1880 suggests that the east wall was also a gable end. It was decided that the best strategy was to place Unit 5 (N1122 E1070) inside the jail, Unit 4 (N1128 E1070) just outside the jail, and Unit 8 (N1127 E1059) on a regular round depression that might be a privy associated with the jail (Figure 3). Privies, while in use, not only served as receptacles of human waste, but also were convenient facilities for disposing of trash. In fact, any pits were used to discard material before the advent of modern dumps and landfills. Privies, cisterns, and wells, as looters know, often contain intact objects like complete bottles, but also textiles, leather, and other objects that decay under normal archaeological conditions.

An internal wall foundation was located in Unit 5 (Figure 4) and the remains of a chimney and hearth in Unit 4 (see Figure 3). The depression that Unit 8 tested, however, was likely the result of a treefall and not a privy shaft.

---

The Perry County Jail

Many local residents remembered the Perry County Jail that once held the nefarious outlaw James Copeland. Evidently the jail was a single-story brick structure with the front door on the west wall. Local residents who visited the excavation stated that they believed that the office was in the north section of the building. There were still brick walls standing in the 1970s, and residents remembered playing around the jail ruin as children. The location of the jail was identified through these informants. In this investigation, it was identified as a regular rectangular depression where the
Most of the artifacts recovered from the Perry County Jail are classified as Architectural (83.4%). Most of these are well-fired handmade brick fragments and pieces of the later tin roof. A photograph of the jail house dating sometime in the nineteenth century shows this structure with a wood shake (shingle) roof (Young and Kidd 1998). The paucity of wire nails suggests that the tin roof was attached with cut nails. The tin roof probably replaced the shake roof before 1890, when wire nails became cheap and easily available. No window glass was recovered from the jail, but the placement of the units inside the building and near the chimney probably accounts for this lack. Table 2 presents a breakdown of the Architectural artifacts recovered from the jail.

Table 2. Architectural artifacts recovered from the Perry County Jail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handmade brick fragments</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified brick fragments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin roof pieces</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut nails</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire nails</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kitchen artifacts from the jail site consist of twenty-seven sherds of plain ironstone and three sherds of unidentified container glass. Three ironstone sherds of a wash basin (Furniture Group) were also recovered, as were twelve pieces of coal and two small pieces of charcoal (Activities Group).

The artifacts are consistent with what would be expected at such a special function building. Additionally, the high frequency of cut nails relative to wire nails is consistent with a mid-to-late-nineteenth-century occupation date (Young 1991, 1994).

While the actual structural remains of the jail have been disturbed by people scavenging brick, there is still much that can be learned from excavations here. One question that has not been resolved is the date of construction. Also, how the building changed through time is poorly understood. For example, a chimney once stood at the north end of the building but does not appear in the early photograph. Also, the photograph shows a wood shake roof, but the archaeological excavations clearly indicate that the structure had a tin roof. The interior wall located in Unit 5 shows something of the layout of the rooms and the use of the space within the jail. An engraving published in J. R. S. Pitts' (1909) book concerning the confession of James Copeland shows Copeland in the jail cell and Pitts taking notes in another room of the jail (Figure 5). Further excavations could ascertain the number of cells and the location of the office. Additionally, other depressions around the jail may represent privy shafts or other features. These should be identified and excavated before bottle hunters find them. Further work at the Old Augusta Jail is recommended. Such work may not only verify some of the Copeland tales, but also aid in our understanding of the role of the jail in this community.

Benjamin Stevens Store

According to the Perry County History written by WPA workers, the Benjamin Stevens Store in Old Augusta was established in 1866. The 1860 census (USBC 1860) of Augusta already lists Stevens as a merchant, so perhaps the store predates 1866. The 1870 census (USBC 1870) of Perry County lists Benjamin Stevens...
of a recent fire in the vicinity of the depressions and brick concentrations. Two units were used to test the area: Unit 6 (N1149 E1069) and Unit 7 (N1152 E1067) (Figure 6). Unit 6 contained a laid-in brick concentration that is likely one of the pier supports for the structure (Feature 1). Unit 7 contained no features.

The diversity of artifacts recovered from the Benjamin Stevens General Store is greater than that from the jail site. Although Architectural artifacts dominate the assemblage (46% of the total assemblage and 81% of the identified assemblage), other artifacts offer clues about the kind of goods offered for sale at the store. Such a general store might have sold dishes, pots and pans, other kitchen utensils, sewing implements, kerosene lamps, nails, window glass, and various types of hardware. Some of these types of materials were recovered in the limited excavations of this general store location (Table 3).

While nails and window glass may have been sold at the Benjamin Stevens Store, they may represent the remains of the building, and thus may offer information as to how the structure appeared. Table 4 presents the variety of Architectural artifacts recovered from Units 6 and 7.

If the nails and window glass are remains of the building, then the store was a wood building on brick piers with at least one glazed window. Be-
because window glass (cylinder glass rather than plate or crown glass) increases in thickness throughout the nineteenth century, measurements provide dates for buildings, or at least episodes of window breakage and replacement (Roenke 1978). Table 5 presents window glass thickness (in millimeters) for the sherds recovered in Units 6 and 7 from Benjamin Stevens' store.

The majority of the window glass, approximately 73%, measures between 1.5 and 2.0 millimeters, which generally dates between 1845 and 1885. These dates match nicely for what would be expected from the archival research concerning the Benjamin Stevens Store.

A number of artifacts that appear to represent merchandise sold in the store include several medicine bottles (broken but reconstructable), ceramics, nails, other bottle glass, window glass, and metal. One particularly interesting artifact recovered from Unit 7 is a slate pencil fragment. While broken, there is no evidence of use or wear. This probably means that slate pencils were sold in the store.

Given the ambiguity with the dates associated with Benjamin Stevens, this area should receive further testing to more precisely determine the dates of occupation. There was some indication of burning, with quantities of charcoal and ash observed throughout the five levels that were excavated. Did the store burn? Also, because few records have survived, it would be interesting to better document the types of goods sold in the store. It is possible that the goods carried in the store may reflect the shift from cattle production to the timbering industry in the Pine Hills. Also, the size of the structure is still undetermined and needs investigation.

The Perry County Courthouse

Two units, Unit 11 (N1142 E1019) and Unit 12 (N1139 E1024), were placed in the area tentatively identified as the Perry County Courthouse on the map drawn for the nomination of Old Augusta to the National Register of Historic Places. Excavations revealed a partial brick foundation and evidence of burning. Local legend suggests that this structure burned several times during the nineteenth century, and these incidents seemed to coincide with an accumulation of warrants or liens on the town's citizens. While it is doubtful that further excavations would reveal clues about arson, such work could determine whether there were multiple fires.

A corner of a brick foundation that was designated as Feature 6 (Figure 7) was uncovered in Unit 11 along with numerous cut nails, brick, burned wood, burned window glass, cinders, and other metal. Unit 12 contained very high frequencies of window glass.
A total of 1119 artifacts was recovered from the remains of the Perry County Courthouse. The majority of the artifacts are classified as Architectural (Table 6). Brick from Feature 6 in Unit 11 is handmade and well-fired, with evidence of mortar. None of the bricks in the foundation were collected, but 129 pieces of brick rubble were brought to the laboratory for analysis.

Interestingly, the majority of the Architectural artifacts are window glass. Further, almost all of the window glass was recovered from Unit 12. Many of the window glass sherds show evidence of a fire, and indeed, the very high frequency of window glass seems to verify that this structure burned at least once. Figure 8 shows the frequency of window glass in thickness categories recovered from the courthouse units.

The majority of the window glass measures between 1.8 and 2.3 millimeters. According to Roenke (1978), cylinder glass of this thickness generally dates between 1850 and 1900. Because the distribution forms a single peak, however, the window glass does not appear to show a series of fires. A series of fires separated in time should, theoretically, contain a peak for each firing episode, unless the fires occurred in rapid succession. Rather, it appears that a single fire caused window glass to be broken and deposited in the archaeological record at this location. When the window glass is separated by levels, there appears to be no difference. Window glass from Level 1 (Figure 9), Level 2 (Figure 10), and Level 3 (Figure 11) shows a single peak around 1.8 or 1.9 millimeters.

Because the window glass was recovered from one excavation unit, the interpretation of a single fire at the courthouse is tentative. It may be that localized fires within the courthouse did not damage all windows at the same time and more extensive excavation could recover additional window glass. This would provide better dates of construction and fire episodes at this structure. Also, more data concerning site formation processes would be obtained from further excavations, which would also aid in the interpretation.
Other artifacts were recovered from Units 11 and 12 at the Perry County Courthouse, including some limited Kitchen artifacts, a slate pencil, and two pieces of a stoneware stub stemmed tobacco pipe (Table 7).

Because of the limited excavation and artifactual evidence, it is difficult to state unequivocally that the remains in Units 11 and 12 represent the Perry County Courthouse. The clear evidence in both units of a fire, and the dates associated with the window glass, do appear to support this interpretation, however.

Further work to determine the construction dates of the building and the date(s) of the burning of the courthouse is strongly recommended. Additionally, little archaeology at a public building such as a courthouse, which was the hub of a great deal of activity, has been conducted, in spite of the fact that the role of the county courthouse is almost legendary in the culture of the South as the virtual eco-

| Table 7. Non-architectural artifacts recovered from the Perry County Courthouse. |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Artifact**    | **Frequency**   |
| Kitchen Artifacts |                 |
| Ironstone       | 2               |
| Unidentified container glass | 23 |
| Whiteware       | 3               |
| Activities Artifacts |         |
| Charcoal        | 45              |
| Slate pencil    | 1               |
| Tobacco Artifacts |               |
| Stoneware tobacco pipe | 2   |
| Furniture Artifacts |             |
| Porcelain figurine | 1           |
nomie and cultural center of southern life (Newton 1974; Moore 1989; Wooster 1969). Market days coincided with court days (typically the first Monday of the month). Presumably, the types of activities that took place inside the courthouse would be reflected in the archaeological record, which could help us better understand the formal and informal activities associated with government.

The "Quarters"

The "Quarters" is where African Americans are said to have lived in Old Augusta, especially after the Civil War. Typical of many African-American sites in Mississippi, there is very little documentary evidence. The location of the "Quarters" was identified by interviews of local residents and referred to in the local history of Perry County. It is located in the western section of the area that was tested. The elevation is low and the soils are more poorly drained than in other areas that were tested archaeologically. The abandonment of Old Augusta by whites, which was nearly complete by the turn of the century, meant that the area was no longer considered optimal real estate. Such abandoned or liminal areas have been settled by African Americans across the South, and indeed all over the United States (Geismar 1982; Joseph 1997).

A total of five one-by-one meter units tested the area known as the "Quarters." Units were placed in brick concentrations or near very old cedar trees, which, according to local informants, were often planted near residences. Very little material was recovered from Units 1 (N963 E1050), 14 (N1068 E930), and 15 (N1068 E950). Units 2 (N1049 E899) and 3 (N1052 E899), however, revealed substantial information concerning nineteenth- and twentieth-century occupation of this section of Old Augusta.

A total of 1936 artifacts was recovered from the area known by local residents as the "Quarters." As in all other excavation units, the majority of artifacts from the "Quarters" are classified as Architectural. The majority of the Architectural artifacts are handmade bricks and brick fragments (Table 8). In addition to brick, limited quantities of nails, especially cut nails, and window glass were also recovered. However, the few wire nails and the single piece of plate glass, which was used for windows primarily in the twentieth century, suggest that the structure dates to or was occupied into the twentieth century. The Architectural artifacts are consistent with a wood structure sitting on brick piers, perhaps with a brick fireplace and at least one glazed window (Figure 12). However, this tentative reconstruction must be tested with further field work.

Besides Architectural artifacts, Kitchen and other artifacts were recovered at this structure. Table 9 lists the Kitchen artifacts recovered from Units 2 and 3 at the "Quarters." The limited number of Kitchen artifacts is consistent with a late-nineteenth- to early-

Table 8. Architectural artifacts recovered from the "Quarters."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut nails</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire nails</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified nails</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window glass, cylinder</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window glass, plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slag</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Reconstruction of the dwelling in the "Quarters" by Richard Cawthon, Mississippi Department of Archives and History.

2 Ibid.
Table 9. Kitchen artifacts recovered from the “Quarters.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware plate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified whiteware</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass canning jar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified container glass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

twentieth-century date of occupation. Other artifacts recovered from the area of the “Quarters” include coal (n=29) and charcoal (n=5), and very thick table-top plate glass (n=2) similar to the glass placed on bureaus and coffee tables today.

No in situ foundations were discovered in Units 2 and 3, where most of the information about the “Quarters” was gathered. The brick rubble, however, is virtually identical to the brick found at the jail and the courthouse. Perhaps the brick used for piers and fireplaces in the “Quarters” was scavenged from abandoned buildings. The window glass may also have been acquired from abandoned buildings. Additional work at this structure and nearby areas to locate other dwellings in the “Quarters” would go far to answer many questions about life in this postbellum African-American community in the Pine Hills. It is especially critical for archaeologists to use data from sites such as the “Quarters” to reconstruct housing conditions, to explore if there were marked differences in economic status within this neighborhood, and to determine how many people lived in this part of the old community. Such data are not available from documentary sources, and there has been little scholarly research concerning black history and culture in the Pine Hills.

The Unidentified Structure

Units 9 (N1099 E977), 10 (N1099 E974), and 13 (N1098 E978) were excavated in an area west of the courthouse where bricks were found concentrated on the surface. A laid-in brick foundation (Feature 5) was uncovered in Unit 9. A small builder’s trench was associated with this foundation. After the area was probed for more of the foundation, Unit 13 was opened. The brick foundation was found extending into Unit 13, and a possible chimney base was also uncovered (Figure 13). Because of the scanty domestic debris recovered from these three units, it is believed that Feature 5 represents the remains of the Methodist Church shown on the map included in the National Register nomination.

Two hundred thirty-one artifacts that are associated with the supposed Methodist Church were recovered. The majority of the artifacts, presented in Table 10, are Architectural. The presence of the cut and wire nails may indicate that the building was a wooden structure resting on a brick foundation. The only other material recovered from Units 9, 10, and 13 includes a single piece of unidentified iron and two sherds of unidentified glass, possibly part of a kerosene lamp. Additional work may shed light on the type of building represented in the area.

The paucity of artifacts recovered from the three units associated with this structure makes any interpretation tentative. The most likely identification for this structure is the Methodist Church. The lack of domestic debris may rule out the possibility that this structure was a dwelling or a general store, the other two buildings noted on the National Register map. Additional testing is necessary, however, because this structure may be a small
outbuilding, such as a smokehouse, that was only used for a brief period of time and would therefore have few artifacts accumulated around the structure. Such work would provide a larger sample of artifacts for comparison with materials from churches, smokehouses, and other small buildings with relatively small assemblages.

Summary and Conclusions

Archaeological investigations at Old Augusta (22-Pe-1605) illustrate that there is much information yet buried that pertains to life in this Pine Hills community. During its long history, from the first decades of the nineteenth century to its abandonment in the early twentieth century, Old Augusta served as a commercial hub for the residents in the immediate area, as well as a link between Mobile and Natchez. Oral history and local legends abound concerning events like the hanging of James Copeland and slave auctions on a block in front of the courthouse, but virtually nothing is available from the scant surviving documentary record concerning daily life and material conditions. The reconstruction of past lifeways and how lifeways changed through time is the crux of archaeology. The limited testing at Old Augusta revealed the potential of the archaeological record at this National Register site.

The archaeological remains of five structures with associated features were uncovered within the boundaries of the Pat Harrison Waterways District during the archaeological testing at Old Augusta (Table 11). The archaeological evidence combined with the oral history collected when the site was nominated for listing on the National Register of Historic Places allowed for some tentative identifications of these five structures.

One structure was the famous jail that held James Copeland. Some of the brick walls were still above the surface as late as the 1970s. Excavation located an interior wall foundation, the cement floor, and the remains of a fireplace on the north end of the building. Most of the material collected in excavations is Architectural. However, precise dates of construction have not been determined. Before the bottle looters and brick scavengers finish destroying this important area of Old Augusta, additional work is necessary.

Another structure tentatively identified in archaeological testing is the Benjamin Stevens Store. Documentary evidence suggests that this store was in operation from 1860 until about 1900. Local residents believe that the archaeological remains of this structure were destroyed by the road just to

the north of the brick scatter and depression that were tested. However, two one-by-one meter units revealed a brick footer or pier, window glass, and nails associated with this structure. In addition, artifacts representing what may have been sold in the store were recovered. The dates of manufacture of many of the artifacts from units at the suspected location of the store help corroborate its identification.

The Perry County Courthouse was also tested archaeologically with two one-by-one meter units. In one unit a brick foundation was discovered, along with abundant quantities of charcoal. The other unit yielded over six-hundred sherds of “exploded” window glass that indicate at least one fire. Date ranges for the window glass at the courthouse show a long occupation from the early nineteenth century to the late nineteenth century. Local legend suggests that not only was the courthouse an important activity area for county residents as they filed suits and purchased and sold real estate, but that an auction block in front of the structure was where slaves were bought and sold. No archaeological evidence of the selling of slaves has been uncovered, but the very limited testing cannot rule out this possibility.

**Table 11. Structures, units, and features at Old Augusta.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>N1128 E1070</td>
<td>Brick chimney, Fea. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1122 E1070</td>
<td>Floor and brick foundation, Fea. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1127 E1059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>N1149 E1069</td>
<td>Brick pier, Fea. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1152 E1067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courthouse</td>
<td>N1142 E1019</td>
<td>Brick foundation, Fea. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1139 E1024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The &quot;Quarters&quot;</td>
<td>N1049 E899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1052 E899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>N1099 E977</td>
<td>Brick foundation, Fea. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1099 E974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1098 E978</td>
<td>Brick foundation, Fea. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
outbuilding, such as a smokehouse, that was only used for a brief period of time and would therefore have few artifacts accumulated around the structure. Such work would provide a larger sample of artifacts for comparison with materials from churches, smokehouses, and other small buildings with relatively small assemblages.

Summary and Conclusions

Archaeological investigations at Old Augusta (22-Pe-1605) illustrate that there is much information yet buried that pertains to life in this Pine Hills community. During its long history, from the first decades of the nineteenth century to its abandonment in the early twentieth century, Old Augusta served as a commercial hub for the residents in the immediate area, as well as a link between Mobile and Natchez. Oral history and local legends abound concerning events like the hanging of James Copeland and slave auctions on a block in front of the courthouse, but virtually nothing is available from the scant surviving documentary record concerning daily life and material conditions. The reconstruction of past lifeways and how lifeways changed through time is the crux of archaeology. The limited testing at Old Augusta revealed the potential of the archaeological record at this National Register site.

The archaeological remains of five structures with associated features were uncovered within the boundaries of the Pat Harrison Waterways District during the archaeological testing at Old Augusta (Table 11). The archaeological evidence combined with the oral history collected when the site was nominated for listing on the National Register of Historic Places allowed for some tentative identifications of these five structures.

One structure was the famous jail that held James Copeland. Some of the brick walls were still above the surface as late as the 1970s. Excavation located an interior wall foundation, the cement floor, and the remains of a fireplace on the north end of the building. Most of the material collected in excavations is Architectural. However, precise dates of construction have not been determined. Before the bottle looters and brick scavengers finish destroying this important area of Old Augusta, additional work is necessary.

Another structure tentatively identified in archaeological testing is the Benjamin Stevens Store. Documentary evidence suggests that this store was in operation from 1860 until about 1900. Local residents believe that the archaeological remains of this structure were destroyed by the road just to the north of the brick scatter and depression that were tested. However, two one-by-one meter units revealed a brick footer or pier, window glass, and nails associated with this structure. In addition, artifacts representing what may have been sold in the store were recovered. The dates of manufacture of many of the artifacts from units at the suspected location of the store help corroborate its identification.

The Perry County Courthouse was also tested archaeologically with two one-by-one meter units. In one unit a brick foundation was discovered, along with abundant quantities of charcoal. The other unit yielded over six-hundred sherds of “exploded” window glass that indicate at least one fire. Date ranges for the window glass at the courthouse show a long occupation from the early nineteenth century to the late nineteenth century. Local legend suggests that not only was the courthouse an important activity area for county residents as they filed suits and purchased and sold real estate, but that an auction block in front of the structure was where slaves were bought and sold. No archaeological evidence of the selling of slaves has been uncovered, but the very limited testing cannot rule out this possibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>N1128 E1070</td>
<td>Brick chimney, Fea. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1122 E1070</td>
<td>Floor and brick foundation, Fea. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1127 E1059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>N1149 E1069</td>
<td>Brick pier, Fea. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1152 E1067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courthouse</td>
<td>N1142 E1019</td>
<td>Brick foundation, Fea. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1139 E1024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The &quot;Quarters&quot;</td>
<td>N1049 E899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1052 E899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>N1099 E977</td>
<td>Brick foundation, Fea. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1099 E974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1098 E978</td>
<td>Brick foundation, Fea. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “Quarters” is reputedly where African Americans lived after freedom. Evidently this small black community served as home for servants who worked for residents of New Augusta across the river. Five one-by-one meter units tested this area, and one location of a dwelling was revealed. It appears that the residents of this home reused handmade bricks from abandoned buildings of Old Augusta. Tentatively, it appears that the bricks were used to make pier or corner foundations and possibly a fireplace. Scant window glass precluded determining Architectural dates, although windows could have been scavenged as well as bricks. The two units that focused on this single dwelling illustrate the potential for intensive archaeological research on the “Quarters.”

The fifth area of structural remains located archaeologically may represent the Methodist Church. A brick foundation of very poorly fired handmade brick was revealed in two units. The three units that tested the area yielded almost no domestic debris; rather, the paucity of such material suggests that this building had a special purpose. The other buildings in this area noted on the National Register form are a dwelling and another general store. Because of the nature of the artifacts from this structure, it is tentatively identified as the Methodist Church.

More archaeological work is recommended for all five structures. Additionally, many areas within the Pat Harrison Waterways District need surveying to identify the remains of other structures. Through such work, this state agency will be able to manage these cultural resources more effectively.

The potential for this site to yield important information about early residents of Perry County from the first decades of the nineteenth century until around 1920 is tremendous. The early settlers in this part of the Pine Hills are poorly documented because of the fire or fires at the Perry County Courthouse. The archaeological remains of the special purpose buildings of the jail, courthouse, Benjamin Stevens’ store, and the possible Methodist Church contain a wealth of information that could be used to interpret this Pine Hills community. The “Quarters” also need further investigation, as do other dwelling houses at Old Augusta, to provide more insight into the lifeways of its diverse inhabitants.

To date, very few large-scale investigations at historic sites in the Pine Hills have been accomplished. A great deal of information can come from such future investigations. The archaeological testing of structural remains within Old Augusta is just a first step toward a greater understanding of the cultural development in this region of Mississippi.
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Book Reviews


Reviewed by Jay K. Johnson

The Research Laboratories of Archaeology and the University of North Carolina Press at Chapel Hill have issued a CD-ROM report on the excavation and analysis of a small, historic Siouan village in the Piedmont of North Carolina. I haven't had as much fun with a computer since the kids and I discovered the 3-D version of Castle Wolfenstein. Of course, you can't shoot anyone in Excavating Occaneechi Town, but you don't have to worry about vertigo either. After a week of exploring this CD, I am convinced that the standard paper monograph has become obsolete. In addition to being an exciting new medium, however, this is also a very good piece of scholarship, and I should probably begin by reviewing the report. Then I'll get to the gee-whiz stuff.

The focus of the monograph is a small palisaded village on a broad bend in the Eno River of north central North Carolina. The site was almost completely excavated in the early 1980s as part of a long-term exploration of late prehistoric and historic Siouan sites in the Carolina Piedmont. The authors do a convincing job of combining archaeological and historical documents to argue that this is the site of the historic Occaneechi for a short period of time at the very end of the seventeenth century. The village consisted of ten or eleven houses surrounding an open area that contained a sweat lodge. Two gates are evident in the palisade and several burials are located in a cemetery area just outside the palisade. The artifact assemblage, architectural data, and historical documents all agree that the site was occupied for only a few decades, making it ideal for the kind of graphic presentation and interpretation used in the report.

The report follows a standard format with separately authored sections on ceramics, lithics, shell, and historic artifacts as well as plant and animal
remains. The text was drawn from several different earlier reports, journal articles, and conference presentations, as well as material written specifically for the CD. The descriptive data are bracketed by some very good introductory and interpretive sections. The broader results of the entire Siouan project are used, particularly in the conclusions, to interpret the Occaneechi Town data and the place of these people in the evolving culture and economy of the Early Contact and Historic periods in North Carolina.

The result is a remarkably detailed picture of European contact and its impact on native North Americans. In the space available, I can only emphasize the highlights. The documentary data indicate that the Occaneechi acted as middlemen, controlling access to interior Siouan tribes in the deer skin trade. Certainly the variety and amount of trade goods found in the burials in contrast with some of the contemporary sites to the west supports this interpretation. In particular, the Occaneechi seem to have structured the flow of trade goods into the interior, allowing beads and other ornaments, keeping the guns and tools for themselves.

In spite of the richness of the grave offerings in terms of items of European manufacture and their proximity to English settlements, there appears to have been relatively little impact on the basic subsistence and technology of the Occaneechi at the turn of the century. Trade goods are not abundant in the trash deposits, native ceramics and stone tools were still manufactured and used, and only a few domesticated animal bones or plant remains from European cultivars were found. Burial practices, other than a change in location and pit shape and the substitution of European artifacts for native grave goods, show a good deal of continuity, as does architecture.

There are some changes, however. Although projectile points, perforators, retouched flakes, and choppers are common, indicating that stone tools had not been replaced by metal, one class of artifacts is conspicuously missing from a regional perspective. Thumbnail scrapers show up in abundance along the western and northern frontiers of the English trading network in the Southeast at about this same time and appear to reflect a response to the deer skin trade in regions where metal for tools was very hard to come by. Only a few, crudely shaped scrapers were found at the site. It may be that the Occaneechi did use metal for those tasks where the advantage of the raw material was considerable. It is likely that one metal scraper would have replaced a large number of stone scrapers.

One other aspect of the Occaneechi results is interesting from a western perspective. Using the data derived from the entire Siouan project, Ward and Davis make it clear that there was no demographic collapse that could be related to pandemic disease introduced during the initial contact early in the sixteenth century. Not until the much more intensive contact of the late seventeenth century does the mortality rate show a marked increase. This may be, as the authors suggest, related to aboriginal population density and social integration. That is, different things appear to have been happening in different parts of the Southeast, depending on the nature of the population into which the early Spanish pathogens were introduced.

Although many of these results were available before, the CD-ROM format allows a great deal of data to be integrated in ways that we only dreamed of in the past. All of the text has hyperlinks to references, photographs, maps, videos, tables, and footnotes. If you want to see a photograph of the artifacts or structure under discussion, you just click your mouse on the highlighted link. Of course, the text is fully searchable. For example, one of the first things I wanted to know was if there were scrapers. A search for that word found all the text references to the few crude stone scrapers that were recovered.

Because of the storage capacity of a CD, the authors did not have to worry about some technical editor demanding that they cut back on the number of halftones in the report. There are more than one thousand full color figures, providing a graphic coverage that is unprecedented. The color is particularly critical in illustrating different raw material types, ceramic characteristics, and, of course, glass beads. It didn't hurt that the Research Laboratory had a huge archive of beautiful excavation photographs, made long before anyone imagined that they could have been used in this way. If you get a kick out of photos of ten-foot squares with meticulously troweled floors showing wall trenches, post stains, and pits, you'll be pleased with this CD.

There are seven videos; all but one are part of a very good archaeological primer with short discussions and excellent illustrations of basics like gridding a site, removing the plowzone, troweling, water screening, and more. There are some very nice interactive features. For example, as you move the pointer around a sample grid, the grid coordinates read out at the bottom of the illustration.
The videos are nice—I watched most of them several times—but the real power of the medium is best illustrated in the Excavations section. In order to give you some idea of the scope of the revolution, I have captured some screen shots from the report. When I opened the excavations chapter in the main menu, I expected a standard textual description of “here’s where we dug and what we found.” What I saw was a map of the site with all the features, post holes, structures, and squares plotted (Figure 1). After you decide which of these contexts you want to explore further, you can move the cursor across the map and get a readout of the feature designation at the cursor location. For example, I have selected Structure 1, the probable sweat house.

When you click on Structure 1, a detailed map of the structure appears (Figure 2). You can go several places from this screen. There are three images of the structure that you can view by using the left or right arrow, slide bar, or the go and stop symbols (square and triangle). On features with four or five images, scrolling through the scenes is often like a time lapse sequence of their discovery and excavation. Figure 3 shows the structure completely excavated.
You can also use the mouse to select any one of the features shown in the structure map in Figure 2. For example, I chose Feature 9, the fire pit in the center of the structure. That took me to a detailed plot of the feature similar to Figure 2. You can explore the plot itself. Plotted artifacts are often linked to photographs. Or you can go to the artifact inventory for the feature (Figure 4), which lists the contexts used in excavating the feature (top half of data field) and the major artifact categories used in the preliminary context inventory (bottom half). For example, the highlighted context "Troweling Top of Pit," contained two chipped stone projectile points and one potsherd.

There is a check mark in the projectile point row under the "Photo" column. If you click on the check mark, you are linked to a photograph of the artifacts under consideration (Figure 5). You can also click on the arrow under the column labeled "More." This takes you to the Lithic Database where the two projectile points are highlighted (Figure 6). Four of thirteen observations are evident in this figure. Additional data fields include raw
material, measurements, edge characteristics, and context. This database can be sorted by each data field or subset by multiple data fields. So, for example, you could display all the straight based projectile points made of rhyolite from the entire site.

As useful and intuitive as the database manager that comes with the CD is, I would certainly want to be able to do more if I were to take a very close look at the Ocmeechi Town lithics. I set about hacking my way into the data files on the CD. I made some progress on my own but finally called in a friend who spends most of his day working in databases and answering computer questions. We worked for a while trying to use different spreadsheets and data managers to open the lithics database with no luck. Finally, he asked me what the data looked like, so we opened it through the Ocmeechi Town program. He asked if I had tried the “Help” option on the screen. Of course I hadn’t. He did and found an entry entitled “Using External Files,” in which we found out that there are three versions of the text file that can be accessed using different third party software, bitmap versions of all the photographs and charts, AutoCAD Exchange versions of the maps and feature drawings, and the databases were formatted in dBase III or Paradox, two formats that can be read by most data managers. The authors have made the data on more than 100,000 artifacts completely accessible to reexamination in a way that is unprecedented in archaeology. This, I think, is where this medium will revolutionize the field. When I first came to Ole Miss, we wanted to look at someone else’s results in a different way. That required a month of work in the computer center, keypunching and proofing the data tabulated in their report. Now, with the click of a mouse, I can conduct my own analysis of the Ocmeechi data. We can only hope that this remarkable standard for accessibility will continue as others take up this medium.

Although it would be hard to imagine a better first example, I do have a few suggestions. It will take me a while to get used to reading a large amount of text on screen. I like books. Part of what I like is the convenience. I haven’t been able to read this one at home, in bed, during lunch, and so on. Another thing I like about paper is the fact that I can underline and make notes in the margins. Some of my favorite books have two or three decades’ worth of comments. You can’t do this with Ocmeechi Town, but you could come close by using something like the bookmark function common to most Web browsers. It seems to me that it could be modified so that it not only marked particular passages but associated and stored short, user-generated comments. That wouldn’t help the fact that it is uncomfortable to read a screen when you wear bifocals, but it would make the medium more amenable to scholarly manipulation.

The CD was also designed as a teaching tool and has a section called the electronic dig. The program starts with a blank site map, and the “excavator” begins by selecting a group of squares to dig. This exposes some of the features, post holes, and house patterns evident in the original site map. You then have the choice of excavating the features or opening more squares. If you are working with a restricted budget—one of the options in the program—that decision is guided by how much the proposed excavations would cost and how much you have left. This exercise and the tutorial will give students a very real feel for archaeological field research, and the excavation routine takes full advantage of the graphic interface that is used throughout the CD. You can also write a list of the artifacts recovered in your subsample to disc so that you could use these data in an analysis. However, I was disappointed to find that the artifact inventory in Appendix A (Figure 4), rather than a subset of the artifact database in Appendix B (Figure 6), was output. This severely limits the kind of analysis the students could perform. Still, the electronic dig would be very effective at an introductory level, and the fact that the Appendix B data are fully accessible outside the program makes them a valuable teaching resource for a graduate level class.

These are small quibbles that could easily be addressed in later issues from Chapel Hill. And we must hope that they will continue this remarkable beginning. The rest of us will be playing catch-up from now on. You can find out more about this remarkable publication by visiting the Web site at http://sunsite.unc.edu/uncpress/ocmeechi/.

Jay Johnson is a professor of anthropology at the University of Mississippi.

Reviewed by Samuel O. Brookes

The first thing that strikes you about this book is the cover. It features photographs of Philip Phillips, James A. Ford, and James B. Griffin, the founding fathers of the Lower Mississippi Survey. How very apropos for a volume dealing with the Central Mississippi Valley. Also what a propitious time for such a volume. At the last two meetings of the Mississippi Association of Professional Archaeologists, the Yazoo Basin was stated to be the best known area of the state from an archaeological point of view. Arguably this may be the case, but one simply has to peruse McNutt’s volume to realize that there is a great deal of disagreement on what we think we know, and that this knowledge is based on very little hard evidence. If we had to enter a court of law with such data we would lose our shirts at the very least.

This volume grew out of a mini conference held in conjunction with the Southern Anthropological Society meetings in Memphis in April of 1989. Scholars active in their respective regions were invited and gave papers. These papers were revised and submitted for publication. The exception was my chapter on Mississippi. For a number of reasons I was not able to complete it, for which I will forever despair because I would love to have been a part of this volume. I am grateful for the chance to review it and certainly want to get some opinions in, so those of you looking for a short review may wish to go elsewhere.

McNutt provides one of the shortest introductions with his page-and-a-half preface. Nevertheless, he opens the door for quite a debate with the following statement: “Some of my colleagues may be surprised to see an unabashed presentation of culture history at this date. I regard fine-tuned culture history as an absolute prerequisite for more theoretically oriented synthesis and processual studies.” There will be those in the processualist and post-processualist schools who will suffer apoplexy at the very thought of this, but I fully agree with Charlie. No doubt about it: culture history is necessary, and while there are some who think it should have been done years ago (and they are correct), the simple matter is that it has not been done to the extent that is necessary. Those wonderful constructs some have made are but a house of cards.

It was only in 1994 that Southeastern Archaeology, in a special issue, formally acknowledged the existence of Archaic mounds in the Southeast. Yes, that is exactly one-hundred years after C. B. Moore’s work on the St. Johns River area of Florida, where he found, illustrated, and published unmistakable Archaic artifacts in mounds with no ceramics. As recently as the late 1970s a National Register nomination was accepted from Mississippi dealing with the redistributive economies of the chieftain at a major Mississippi mound group in north Mississippi. The fact that no shell tempered sherd had been found on the site with all the sand and grog tempered fabric impressed were did not even perturb the young man who wrote the nomination. We now know the site to be Middle Woodland with no Mississippian occupation. Culture history indeed! I could go on, but I hope you get my point, namely, our culture history is not quite the solid ground that some wish (or pretend) it to be. McNutt is to be congratulated for attempting a culture-historical overview of the Central Mississippi Valley. Such has not been available to most of us unless one was fortunate enough to be at Garibaldi’s Pizza on Walker Ave., in Memphis, where McNutt regularly holds forth at lunch.

To begin at the beginning, there are eight chapters in the volume. Chapter one is by Robert H. Lafferty III and James E. Price and is entitled simply “Southeast Missouri.” One is immediately struck by the discussion of Paleo-Indian and Archaic cultures in the region. The authors devote seven lines to Paleo and five to Archaic. To be sure, not a great deal of work has been done on these time periods in the region, but twelve lines is precious little information on ten thousand years of prehistory. The Poverty Point period gets only four lines, and that period includes the entire Late Archaic sequence for the region. Ceramics form the basis for the cultural constructs in this area that have been studied for years. Even then, as the authors point out, there are major gaps in the knowledge of the region. Major areas have not received survey, and few surveyed sites have had adequate testing. The authors do an admirable job of describing the archaeology and problems of the region, providing almost all the radiocarbon dates. From my perspective, they could have included more illustrations of artifacts. This is true for the entire volume, not just this chapter.

Chapter two, “The Western Kentucky Border and the Cairo Lowland” by Barry Lewis, is one of the best in the volume. Professor Lewis starts off
with a discussion of the problems of trying to reconcile two different cultural chronologies for the region, that of Griffin published in 1967 and that of Phillips, published in 1970. Lewis concludes that one must use both, but they don’t quite mesh because of confusion or disagreement on the definitions of “culture period” and “culture.” Lewis observes uncertainties in the literature, pointing out that “Baytown,” depending on how it is used, can apply to all of the Early, Middle, or Late Woodland periods. Lewis also notices confusion as to whether Tchula is Early or Late Woodland or both; I believe our Ole Miss colleague, Janet Ford, would have it going into at least the early part of the Middle Woodland. Coles Creek is another problem: I would argue that the Coles Creek culture does not penetrate into the northern Yazoo Basin. To be sure, there is a Coles Creek time period there; in Newspeak this is often called Emergent Mississippian. But what do we do with the concept of Coles Creek in the Cairo Lowland? Lewis refers to this as simply the Late Woodland phases.

Lewis claims that his phases differ from those of other researchers. His phases use arbitrarily set temporal scales, then the cultural content of these temporal units is used to set up diagnostic markers. The cultural content is then refined through excavation and dating. As to whether Lewis’ phase constructs are different from those of others, I think not. It is my opinion that Professor Lewis is just more honest than most about his methodology. I daresay many of us would have a hard time explaining how we arrived at our temporal limits for phases. Lewis’ chapter is well illustrated and is the most thought-provoking chapter in the volume, save for McNutt’s summary. At the end Lewis proposes several research goals: reconciling the two differing chronologies for the region; devoting more attention to the Archaic; refining the earliest portion of the ceramic sequence; examining the relationships of Crab Orchard material to Tchula ceramics; excavating more mounds; and giving more emphasis to the later phases, especially the Protohistoric and Early Historic (his Jackson phase, A.D. 1540–1650).

Lewis is absolutely right about the Archaic. There is so little known about it that one begins to appreciate just how much work has been done here in Mississippi, yet we are a long way from having a clear understanding of the Archaic. He also provides a caveat concerning the Hypsithermal: lack of Archaic sites should not be interpreted as evidence of Hypsithermal disruption until adequate survey has been done. There is a great deal of new information coming out about the Tchula period in Mississippi. We are unsure about the dates; there is evidence of moundbuilding in some very restricted locales; there is the question of the relationship of Tchula and Marksville cultures; and how does Crab Orchard material (and for that matter what used to be called Sauty Cord—impressed by Heimlich in the Guntersville report) relate to Cormorant Cord—impressed?

Evidence for the Protohistoric and Early Historic periods is rare in the Lower Valley and adjacent areas, as Patricia Galloway and Jay Johnson pointed out in the volume on The Development of Southeastern Archaeology (1993). The Vacant Quarter hypothesis put forth by Stephen Williams is not an acceptable construct in many ways for Professor Lewis, and their ongoing debate will continue to illuminate this time period. As I said earlier, this is one of the most interesting chapters in the book.

Robert Mainfort’s chapter, “The Reelfoot Lake Basin, Kentucky and Tennessee,” suffers from the same problem as Lewis’, in that there is such a dearth of information on the Paleo Indian and Archaic periods. To be sure this is not either of these authors’ fault, but when eight to ten thousand years of prehistory are described in less than two pages, something is amiss. Mainfort attributes this to two factors. The area under consideration is a floodplain, and there is a likelihood that early sites are buried. Also a bias could exist in the survey coverage. Of course, for the latter part of the Early Archaic and Middle Archaic there is the specter of the Hypsithermal. But we cannot rush to judgement; suffice it to say that little is known about these early periods and research designs to investigate them need to be developed.

The Early and Middle Woodland period is discussed in a little more detail, but again this is an area where a lot of work remains to be done. Mainfort has good data on the Late Woodland/Emergent Mississippian. [I hate that last term; why don’t we all say Late Woodland? Is Dalton Emergent Early Archaic? Is Baytown Emergent Coles Creek?] It seems very different from the Northern Yazoo, as one would expect. Mainfort, to his credit, does not even use the term Coles Creek. Descriptions of Early Mississippian and Middle Mississippian are much more detailed than earlier cultures. Mainfort is in disagreement with Lewis about the content and nature of the Late Mississippian and Early Historic periods. I always like it when archaeologists working with similar sites on similar time periods in close
the Plum Bayou culture very well and correctly notes that it has a counterpart, the Peabody phase, in the Northern Yawoo Basin.

The final chapter is the "The Upper Yawoo Basin in Mississippi" by Charles McNutt. I am proud to say that the section dealing with Paleo Indian and Archaic cultures covers ten full pages! That is about equal to coverage in all the other chapters (save the one by Dan and Phyllis Morse) combined. This is a testament to the work of many people, most notably John Connaway and Sam McGahey. McNutt's coverage of the Paleo Indian is very good. I would only add that McGahey's 1987 article in *Mississippi Archaeology*, based upon lithic material, indicates the initial penetration of Mississippi by Paleo Indians was by groups coming south from the Tennessee Valley and also by groups moving south along the Mississippi River floodplain and then east into the major river tributaries. Dalton is present in Mississippi, though it seems very different from Dalton culture in Arkansas. I feel that more than just raw material differences are involved here, though; several different artifact types and site types are evident, so we may be indeed talking about people with different cultural traditions. There is even the possibility of a temporal difference, with Mississippi Dalton being later than Arkansas Dalton.

The Archaic is also rather lengthy in this chapter. McNutt, like Gerald Smith, places the Benton culture in the Late Archaic. Like Smith, McNutt also does not cite Peacock's 1988 article. McNutt does an excellent job when discussing the lapidary industry at the Denton site. He quotes Connaway as saying there is an indigenous lapidary industry there during the Middle Archaic, but that the zoomorphic beads appear to have been brought in as finished artifacts as opposed to being manufactured at the site. McNutt also notes that Jay Johnson has shown that Poverty Point period sites in the Northern Yawoo basin are markedly different from those in Louisiana. All in all, McNutt thoroughly covers the literature of the region, and his chapter is quite good. He shows us what appears to be the sequence, though as he (and many others) admit, there are a number of problems.

I come now to the pièce de résistance, McNutt's summary chapter, the longest in the book. McNutt provides an excellent discussion of the Paleo Indian period. He points out that there are theories that fluted points in the region under study are later than, the same age as, and earlier than western specimens. This is a major research question, and the fact that we cannot answer it is quite telling. Dalton is well covered in this section, but again I would disagree with the assumption that deposits with Daltons and notched points represent mixed components. At several sites lanceolate and notched points are indeed found together. To be sure, these are not the later forms—i.e. Big Sandy etc.—instead these are types called San Patrice and Hardaway. As classic Dalton is traced from Arkansas to the south and east, the oversize points (Sloan) disappear and the notched points begin to appear as one moves into the coastal plain. Webb, Shiner, and Roberts found this at the San Patrice site; Brain found it in the Yawoo Basin; I found it at Hester; Enor found it in Alabama, as did DeJarnette, Kurjack and Cambron at Stanfield-Worley; and Coe found it at Hardaway.

I also have a quailm with the "multifariously named side notched points."

There are two distinct, and admittedly confusing eras of side notched points. The earliest—Graham Cave, which is called Big Sandy in Alabama, Cache River, and Kess—occurs just after Dalton in the Southeast. The later side notched forms—Hickory Ridge, Godar, Raddatz, Hemphill, Big Sandy at the Eva site, and Osceola—are the Hypsithermal intruders from the North for which the Morses and others are looking. As for McNutt's statement "Hardin Barbed is not similar to Scottsbluff I, contrary to Luchterhand (1970) and others," under others add Perino, Brain, Brooks, McGahey, and Melissa Reams. As Hardin moves across the Southeast it evolves into the Lost Lake form; again, this is a Hypsithermal phenomenon.

McNutt gives an excellent account of the problem of basal notched points and typology of the Middle Archaic in general. I would suggest that during this time period the points increase greatly in size. Hypsithermal points are much larger than either their predecessors or successors. McNutt again places Benton in the Late Archaic. He states that Denton points, including Opossum Bayou points, are a far cry from more carefully made Benton points. This is true. However Benton points are present at Denton, as are the "fancy Bentons," the type called Elk River with oblique transverse flaking. When one considers the fact that zoomorphic beads are found on Benton sites in northeast Mississippi and that a Benton period Aberdeen style grooved axe (the only one from the Yawoo Basin) was found at Denton, one has to wonder why Charlie has trouble with the Denton points and zoomorphic beads being associated. Add to this the fact that the only sites that yield zoomorphic beads in the Southeast are those with a Middle Archaic component,
and the association seems only natural. If one needs further proof look at Jaketown, Teoc Creek, and Poverty Point. These three major Poverty Point sites have yielded a total of two zoomorphic beads, both from Poverty Point. Interestingly this latter site is the only one of the three with a Middle Archaic component and classic Denton points. The only real failing of this section is the absence of Middle Archaic mounds and mound groups. In fairness to McNutt and his contributors, however, this phenomenon was not really accepted until a couple of years after the Memphis meeting and then, as now, the mounds were found in Louisiana just south of the Central Mississippi Valley. The point here is that there were mounds in the Middle Archaic, but we did not choose to accept them until 1994, when they were declared to be cool and people went looking for them, much like the truncated pyramidal Middle Woodland mound craze of the mid 1980s inspired by Robert Mainfort’s work at Pinson.

The discussion of the Late Archaic/Poverty Point culture is fun because McNutt comments on the fact that Teoc Creek, one of the Northern Yazoo’s best known Poverty Point sites, lacks a lapidary industry. McNutt finds this unusual because the site is supposed to date between the Denton and Poverty Point sites with their impressive lapidary industries. This does not surprise me, because Teoc Creek does not have much of a blade core industry either. Most Poverty Point sites in the Yazoo Basin look more like Teoc than Jaketown. I have said it before and I will say it again here, were it not for Jaketown and Claiborne, Poverty Point would be considered a Louisiana phenomenon. McNutt notes Jay Johnson’s observation that sites in the Northern Yazoo at this time period are characterized by their extreme variability, while the sites in Louisiana are all very similar in their lithic assemblages. McNutt also cautions against the unwise ascription of sites to the Poverty Point culture based on the presence of Poverty Point objects (clay balls). To this caveat one might add tubular and other types of stone beads, microblades and cores, many types of bannerstones, and some of the projectile point types, especially Gary and Kent. In saying this I have discounted the importance of three of eight of Webb’s primary diagnostic traits for Poverty Point. Another aspect of Poverty Point must be mentioned here. How many times have we all heard Joffre L. Coe praised because his work in the Carolina Piedmont demonstrated that at any one time period there is usually one projectile point style being made? Coe is referred to as the man who killed the golf bag theory of one poor Indian carrying numerous different styles of projectile points, each being designed for a special type of hunting. Poverty Point diagnostics include fourteen different types of projectile points. That’s a golf bag with a vengeance!

For brevity’s sake I will lump Early and Middle Woodland here. A great deal of work remains to be done in the Early Woodland. The question of mounds is one of the most interesting aspects of this period. Middle Woodland is a popular period with too much work done on mounds and not enough on villages in the Central Valley. Paste and temper are hot topics in this time period. It is not enough that Toth defined an “improved Marksville paste”; there are archaeologists who have been arguing about sand tempering and sandy pastes for years: is it intentional, does it have chronological significance, does it have distributional significance, is it cultural, ad nauseam. A more interesting question, asked by James A. Ford, is in which direction did the influence travel along the Mississippi? Was it Marksville going north or Havana going south? While that is no longer discussed much, it has never been satisfactorily answered. McNutt raises the question of the paucity of status objects in the region. Jay Johnson and Fair Hayes in their 1995 article (published after this conference) discuss Hopewellian trade items in the Northern Yazoo. The great majority of these items are not status items, unfortunately, but rather appear to be mundane tools.

McNutt divides the Late Woodland into two periods, the Initial Late Woodland—Baytown (A.D. 400–700) and the Terminal Woodland Florence—Developmental Mississippian (A.D. 700–1000). I can well understand his reasoning here. The first period is the classic Baytown period characterized by plain and cordmarked ceramics, and the latter is the period of Coles Creek culture. Except, of course, Coles Creek culture is a southern phenomenon. As discussed earlier, there is a Coles Creek time period in the Northern Yazoo but there is no Coles Creek culture there. What is manifest in the northern portions of the Central Valley must be called something, and Terminal Woodland Florence is fine with me. Developmental Mississippian sounds better than Emergent Mississippian, which conjures for me a late Baytown culture coming out of the closet with some shell tempered accouterments as a Mississippian drag queen. McNutt feels that cultural elements of the Mayan and Teotihuacan peoples may have been transmitted along the Gulf Coast or the Huasteca area of Northern Mexico.
People have been searching for that connection for over fifty years, and as far as I am aware the only bit of evidence to date is a figurine of "possible" Mesoamerican influence from the Coral Snake mound in Louisiana. Coral Snake is Middle Woodland, a bit too early for McNutt's idea. All in all, however, McNutt does a thorough job of discussing this important time period. One item missing entirely in his summation is warfare. I see evidence for this at the Bonds village site in Tunica County, Mississippi, described by Connaway and McGahey in 1970, and in several reports on the Crenshaw site in southwest Arkansas by Frank Schambach. This will be reflected in the report on the Austin site in Tunica County, Mississippi, where Connaway has recovered the earliest palisade in the Central Valley.

The later cultures are also well covered by McNutt. He addresses the Williams-Lewis dispute over the Vacant Quarter Hypothesis and is rather adept at discussing this without getting caught up in it. I will bypass all the Mississippian to get to the Protohistoric section (A.D. 1541-1673). McNutt discusses the four candidate De Soto routes and states that all four are carefully reasoned, scholarly works, but none are based on actual Spanish campsites. The attempts to correlate archaeological phases with Spanish provinces is always fascinating fun, but like Chinese food, it leaves you yearning for something more. McNutt finally gives Hudspeth's route credence over Brain's. The question of Historic Indian groups is finally just that, a question.

I hope I do not come across as not liking this book. Just the opposite is true. I think it is one of the more important volumes on the region to come out in several years. While I disagree with details in every chapter in this volume, I find that there is a lot more that I either agree with or just plain don't know about. I guess I come closest to subscribing to Brain's route for De Soto, but I am not rabid on the subject as I tend to be with things like Hypsithermal and Poverty Point. The main point I wish to make after pages of this drivel is that our colleagues from the southern part of the Magnolia State were wrong when they stated the Yazoo Basin was the best known part of the state from an archaeological point of view. I am old enough to remember when the Harvard boys (LMS) were criticized for putting a five-foot square into a mound group; then moving on to the next mound group; and, having obtained a collection of fifty-seven sherds, leaving. Sometime between then and now their inadequate testing/survey became holy writ.
of the dynamic field of historical archaeology; rather the edited volume is meant to introduce the reader to several aspects of this field through the written works of practicing archaeologists. In the following review, I will discuss each of the six sections and then briefly discuss each of the articles.

Part I, entitled "Recent Perspectives," includes two articles that provide an overview of historical archaeology and some insight on where the discipline might be headed. The first article, "Avenues of Inquiry in Historical Archaeology," was published in 1982 by Kathleen Deagan. It examines the history of this field and the debate on whether historical archaeology is part of history or anthropology, an issue that Deagan does not believe has been resolved. Deagan also discusses three important avenues to explain the growth of historical archaeology: historical supplementation, reconstruction of past lifeways, and processual studies. According to Deagan, historical archaeology has the potential for making contributions that are not possible through any other discipline. Research from historical archaeological studies is able to answer questions posed by archaeological and anthropological interests as well as provide historical data that is not available through any other source.

The second article in Recent Perspectives, "People with a History: An Update on Historical Archaeology in the United States," by Barbara Little, uses Deagan's article as a starting point, once again emphasizing the important way historical archaeology interprets the past and provides alternatives to historical documents. Little then discusses the growth of historical archaeology and advancements in the areas noted by Deagan. Of particular interest is the extensive bibliography of topical and regional research in the United States. Finally, Little takes historical archaeology in a new direction: the archaeology of capitalism. According to Orser, not all archaeologists agree with this focus today, but it is a relevant viewpoint and is worth exploring. A case study of historic Cherokees is used to illustrate material culture and ideology. The article concludes with the statement that historical archaeology has indeed become part of anthropological archaeology and is a rapidly growing discipline. Little does state that a major crisis faced by historical archaeologists is that of "professional placement" (65) among prehistoric archaeologists. Perhaps because historical archaeology is interdisciplinary, it is still considered an interloper.

Part II, Peoples and Places, includes five articles that provide the reader with information on the diverse places and cultures historical archaeologists study and the research questions posed by them. The first article, "The Archaeology of Mission Santa Catalina de Guale: Our First Fifteen Years," by David Hurst Thomas, examines the history of different researchers searching and finding the Mission Santa Catalina. Next, Thomas discusses the different archaeological research methods used by his project for studying the mission and the artifacts recovered during this study and their possible meaning. He also provides insight on the interaction between indigenous people of the United States and Europeans.

This section's second article, "The Material World of the Revolutionary War Soldier at Valley Forge," by Parrington, Schenck, and Thibau, focuses on the famous encampment area of the Continental Army at Valley Forge during the Revolutionary War. The authors attempt to correlate the historical evidence of the subsistence and equipage of the troops at Valley Forge with the archaeological evidence recovered from four brigade areas. Evidence is compiled from excavations conducted in the 1960s and 1970s. Since there is a large discrepancy in excavating and collecting methods, the authors discuss the artifacts descriptively. They conclude that the pattern of artifacts from all four encampments at Valley Forge "is one of minimalism" (138); the primary items recovered are all basic essentials. Ultimately, due to indiscriminate sampling strategies, conclusions from the paper are speculative. The authors call for long-term archaeological investigations with thoughtfully defined research objectives to provide more conclusive information on Valley Forge during the winter of 1777-78.

The third article in Part II, entitled "The Archaeology of Slave Life," by Theresa Singleton, focuses on information historical archaeology provides about African-American slave life that cannot be attained by the limited historical record they left. Singleton discusses artifacts recovered from slave sites that provide information on slave religion, items that are presumed to have an African origin, diet and food preparation, slave housing, the quality of life in slave cabins, and items that may have been used for ritualistic purposes. She concludes by stating that the future for further studies on African-American slave sites looks bright and will possibly provide answers to further questions posed about African-American life.

Article number four in Part II is entitled "The Overseas Chinese in El Paso: Changing Goals, Changing Realities," by Edward Stasaki. Stasaki studies changing ethnic relations in multicultural west Texas through material
remains from the three largest groups in the area: European-Americans, Mexicans, and overseas Chinese. Interpretations of artifacts and observed artifact patterns of Chinese immigrants and the nature and extent of assimilation this group underwent is the primary focus of this article. Staski concludes that the assimilation process experienced by the overseas Chinese was acculturation and that this ethnic group did not become completely absorbed into the dominant American culture. The overseas Chinese were never a dominant power group in the area. Ethnic boundaries were likely most effectively maintained by limiting social relationships and avoiding structural assimilation.

The final article in Part II is interestingly titled “Mrs. Starr’s Profession,” by Donna Seifert. Seifert examines material remains from 1870-1920 households, some of which were brothels, in Washington D.C.’s Hooker District. Along with artifacts recovered from excavations Seifert also uses historical documents to supplement her information. Seifert concludes that material remains recovered from brothels change through time compared to items recovered from lower income households in the same neighborhood. As prostitution became a more capitalist business in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, artifacts recovered from excavations reflected a more affluent status. One of Seifert’s main arguments is that women were often forced into prostitution because of poverty.

Part III is entitled “Historic Artifacts: A Focus on Ceramics” and includes four articles. Orser discusses the reasons for historical archaeologists’ interest in ceramic artifacts and some of the information these material remains provide. Historic ceramics are particularly useful because of the often accurate records manufacturers kept about the ceramics they produced. Orser does not claim that the four articles included in this section cover all lines of investigation; rather the articles will give the reader a good idea of the ways in which historical archaeologists approach ceramic studies.

The first article in this section is by Sarah Peabody Turnbaugh and is entitled “17th and 18th Century Lead-Glazed Redwares in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.” Since little information and historical documentation are available about lead-glazed redwares, Turnbaugh uses the type-variety method of classifications often employed by prehistoric archaeologists to analyze the ceramic assemblage. Turnbaugh then applies the analysis to redware ceramics recovered from the Salem Village Parsonage site. She concludes that the occupants relied heavily on the domestic redware industry and used English manufactured wares sparingly. Finally, Turnbaugh discusses how the type-variety method for classifying redwares could be applied to other historical sites.

“Factors Influencing Consumer Behavior in Turn-of-the-Century Phoenix, Arizona,” by Susan L. Henry, is the second article in Part III. She discusses the relationship between economic position and ceramic purchase from nineteenth- and twentieth-century archival documents and artifacts recovered from two residential areas in Phoenix. Methods used to analyze the material include Miller’s economic scale of ceramics and butchered food bone. She concludes by stating that from her analyses, many factors, not just socioeconomic status, influenced consumer behavior in turn-of-the-century Phoenix.

Colonoware and slavery are the topic of the third article in Part III entitled “Struggling with Pots in Colonial South Carolina,” by Leland Ferguson. First identified as Native American pottery, colonoware is now thought to be a tradition that combines West African and Native American elements. This uniform and homogeneous class of pottery is thought to reflect the uniformity of most New World slaves. Ferguson also discusses the different foodways of slaves versus other plantation occupants.

The final article in Part III is entitled “Artifacts and Active Voices: Material Culture as Social Discourse,” by Beaudry, Cook, and Mrozowski. The authors examine glass bottles and ceramic artifacts from archaeological deposits from the backlots of a tenement and a boarding house associated with nineteenth- and twentieth-century Boot Mills, Lowell, Massachusetts. In addition to the artifacts recovered from the site, the authors use historical documents to interpret the meaning of the material culture. Rather than looking at artifacts as passive by-products generated through consumption, the artifacts are analyzed as “potent instruments of symbolic action” (214). The authors examine the relationship between mill owners and workers.

The fourth part of this book is entitled “Interdisciplinary Studies” and consists of three articles. This section is included to illustrate the close collaboration between archaeologists and scientists of other disciplines and to show that it is a multidisciplinary endeavor. Although numerous disciplines, such as geography, geology, botany, and zoology, can contribute to the understanding of archaeology, Orser selected three fields used frequently by
historical archaeologists: palynology, zooarchaeology, and physical anthropology.

"Pollen Record Formation Processes at the Isles of Shoals: Botanical Records of Human Behavior," by Kelso and Harrington, examines pollen remains from soil samples taken from the alleged William Pepperell site at the Isle of Shoals, eight miles south of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, in the Atlantic Ocean. Occupation of the island and its surroundings occurred by 1623. Kelso and Harrington do not ignore the microscopic remains from the site; rather they put them to good use. The authors discuss the natural history of the site, such as the clearing of the forest during the European-American era and a blight that killed the chestnut tree population. A relationship between soil disturbances and the construction of the island is also based on pollen analysis.

The second article in Part IV, entitled "A Faunal Analysis of Home Butchering and Meat Consumption at the Hubbell Trading Post, Gando, Arizona," is by Szuter. Szuter, a zooarchaeologist, analyzes animal bones from the Hubbell Trading Post to better understand the dietary habits of past inhabitants. The home butchering of domestic animals, the types of species that were used by the occupants, and the cuts of meat from different temporal and spatial contexts are discussed as well. This article includes several excellent drawings and charts that are helpful in illustrating the author's point.

"Archaeology and Forensic Anthropology of the Human Remains from the Reno Retreat Crossing, Battle of Little Bighorn, Montana," by Scott and Snow is the final article in Part IV. A human skull, a left humerus, and a right clavicle of a skeleton were recovered eroding from a riverbank near the Reno Retreat Crossing. No other artifacts or skeletal remains were recovered from the area in which these finds were made. Scott and Snow analyze the remains in detail, then provide a history of the area and some possible conclusions on who the individual might have been and possible reasons for being in that area.

Part V, entitled "Landscape Studies," contains three articles introducing the reader to what historical archaeologists refer to as landscape studies. Based on Oser's statement that archaeologists, anthropologists, and geographers do not always agree on a definition, but for purposes of the book he defines "landscapes as encompassing all of the natural and cultural features that exist both inside and outside human settlements: houses, bridges, waterways, trees, grass, mountains, and other settlements" (368). Although archaeological investigations must excavate single sites, Oser states that archaeologists may investigate larger areas, a practice illustrated in the last two articles of this section.

In "Interpreting Ideology in Historical Archaeology: Using the Rules of Perspective in the William Paca Garden in Annapolis, Maryland," Mark Leone examines Paca's garden and explains that it is more than simple greenery; it is a statement about society as a whole. Paca was an elite resident, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, a passionate defender of liberty, and a slave owner. According to Leone, Paca's formal garden was not a passive place for idle adornment or food production; rather, it was a very active place "for thinking and for making the observations that were essential to economic and social life" (389).

People make up the landscape in "Plantation Settlement from Slavery to Tenancy: An Example from a Piedmont Plantation in South Carolina," by Orser and Nekola. Millwood Plantation, organized in 1832 and operated until the 1930s, is the site of investigation. Because of the antebellum and postbellum occupation of the plantation, Orser and Nekola find that it is a perfect place to study plantation settlement. Occupation areas of African-American slaves changed after the Civil War took place. Initially they lived in tightly spaced cabins, then occupied nucleated settlements, and finally in the early twentieth century moved to homestead areas for free African Americans.

The final article in Part V, entitled "Overhunting and Local Extinctions: Socio-Economic Implications of Fur Trade Subsistence," by Hamilton, focuses on an entire region in Canada when examining eighteenth and nineteenth century fur trading. Hamilton looks at another aspect of fur trading aside from the economic demand for the fur pelts—the necessity for food.

"International Historical Archaeology" is the title of Part VI. According to Oser, historic archaeological sites are being investigated all over the world, although in other countries and continents, such as Europe, other terms are used to identify this field. Once again, Orser includes three articles to introduce the reader to different types of archaeological research happening outside North America.

In "Historic Sites in Mexico," Fournier-Garcia and Miranda-Flores discuss the history of historical archaeology in Mexico and state that the projects
thus far have been limited. Future researchers in Mexico must not consider historical archaeology an obscure field, and the goals must be the same as those of prehistoric archaeologists. This article does include an extensive bibliography of research that has been undertaken in Mexico.

European contact with the indigenous people of South Africa is discussed in the second article in Part VI, “Historical Archaeology in the Western Cape,” by Hall and Markell. Two important types of research are being explored in South Africa: frontier archaeology and the archaeology of the underclass. Historical archaeology may be able to aid in the understanding of the diverse groups that have lived together for generations in the area of the Western Cape.

Archaeology in the Middle East is the topic of the final article in Part VI, “Tobacco Pipes, Cotton Prices, and Progress,” by Silberman. Early Islamic and Crusader period archaeology have been the two most often explored archaeological subjects in the Middle East. Silberman argues for the value of using archaeology to research the Ottoman Empire, a time often considered a low point in Middle Eastern cultural history. In fact, young researchers have begun to explore this aspect of the complex history of the Middle East. Examination of this time period by Palestinian and Israeli archaeologists is important to both because of a shared heritage during a dramatic period of social change.

Concluding Comments

Overall, I thoroughly enjoyed reading the articles in this edited volume. Orser does an excellent job of organizing the material and providing an introduction to each of the six sections. Several of the articles include extensive bibliographies that provide additional readings. This edited volume is meant to provide the reader with contemporary as well as classic articles. Perhaps some of the articles that were previously published, and considered classics, in the 1980s could have been updated. Also, several articles include few or no illustrations and photographs of places or artifacts being discussed. I would recommend this book to anyone interested in learning about historical archaeology or to anyone teaching a historical archaeology class.

Tara Bond-Freeman is Assistant Curator of Exhibits for the Old Capitol Museum of Mississippi History.