Geospatial and Landscape Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Adaptation in Tenant Farm Communities

An essay submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for graduation from the

Honors College at the College of Charleston

with a Bachelor of Science in

Anthropology

Olivia Leigh Adams

May 2015

Advisor: Dr. Maureen Hays

Table of Contents

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
	LIST OF FIGURES	3
I.	INTRODUCTION	5
II.	PROPERTY HISTORY	8
III.	LITERATURE REVIEW	11
IV.	PREVIOUS RESEARCH	23
V.	METHODS	24
VI.	RESULTS	29
VII.	INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	36
i.	APENDIX A: FIGURES	44
ii.	APENDIX B: MATERIAL CULTURE DATABASE	83
iii.	APENDIX C: GRAPHS	88
	WORKS CITED	95

List of Figures

- Figure 1.1 Dixie Plantation Location Map
- Figure 1.2 Designated Archaeological Sites at Dixie Plantation and Areas of Investigation
- Figure 1.3 1807 Plat
- Figure 1.4 1912 Plat
- Figure 1.5 1919 USGS Topographic Map
- Figure 1.6 1944A USGS Topographic Map
- Figure 1.7 1944B USGS Topographic Map
- Figure 1.8 1943 Plat
- Figure 1.9 1952 Plat
- Figure 2.1 Location Map: Wide Awake Plantation and Adams Run Figure
- Figure 2.2 Williams c. 1918 House
- Figure 2.3 Fiermonte Renovations to c 1918 House
- Figure 5.1 Digitized Houses, Fields, Roads, Railroad on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 5.2 Esri Online Map in Conjunction with Esri App
- Figure 5.3 All Ruins and Dumps Digitized on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 5.4 Area B STP Density (Surfer) over Satellite Imagery
- Figure 5.5 Locations of Test Units 85 and 87 on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 5.6 Portion of 1919 USGS Topographic Map
- Figure 6.1 Portion of 1912 Plat
- Figure 6.2 Railroad and Truck Spur Digitized on Satellite Imagery

- Figure 6.3 Portion of 1943 Plat
- Figure 6.4 Portion of 1943 Plat
- Figure 6.5 Richards Period Housing
- Figure 6.6 Williams Period Housing
- Figure 6.7 Location of Structure 1 In Area B on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 6.8 Location of Structure 2 on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 6.9 Portion of the 1958 Plat
- Figure 6.10 Ruin 1 Photograph
- Figure 6.11 Ruin 2 Photograph
- Figure 6.12 Structure 2, Ruins 1 and 2, and Surface Dump on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 6.13 Standing Structure Chimney Photograph
- Figure 6.14 Surface Dumps Photograph
- Figure 6.15 Structure 1 and Surface Dump on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 6.16 Ruin 3 Location on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 6.17 Landscape Additions 1912-1918
- Figure 6.18 1912 Structures on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 6.19 Portion of 1807 Plat
- Figure 6.6 Proposed Williams Period Landscape Digitized on Satellite Imagery
- Figure 7.1 Location Comparison: Slave Settlement and Early Tenant Housing
- Figure 7.2 Housing Near Willtown Road Digitized on Satellite Imagery

I. Introduction

This paper will address the period of tenant farming in the rural Southeast. Using a landscape archaeological approach to understand historical, archaeological, and geospatial data to create a foundation for understanding this time period in the South Carolina, Lowcountry and the overall rural Southeast. The mid-19th to 20th century is a critical point in American history. It marks an era of increasing industrial production, significant demographic shifts, and restructuring of social relations. Additionally, the end of the Civil War marks the official emancipation of enslaved peoples and the beginning of their struggle to find a place for themselves as American citizens. While this is a very important transitional period historically, archaeologists have paid very little attention to these sites. Some researchers have even gone so far as to publish work describing tenant farmsteads as "trivial, nonsignificant sites" and referring to studying them as "esoteric and even frivolous research" (Padgett 1983, 14-16). Beginning in the 1960's archaeologists began to call attention to the rapidly vanishing tenant lifestyle and the importance of acknowledging this time period archaeologically (Kniffen and Glassie 1966). Since that time several other archaeologists (Anderson and Muse 1982; Orser and Holland 1983; Holland 1990; Trinkley 1983) have affirmed the importance of tenant farming as an archaeological focus emphasizing the increasing scarcity of tenant related archaeological sites due to their ephemeral nature and the systematic destruction of related structures. In addition to their rapid disappearance and the pressing need to record the archaeological evidence of this lifestyle, Henry (1995) emphasizes that there are reasons that we should want to learn more about this time period as 20th century events and technological developments have significantly altered our lives today. The archaeological record can serve as a crucial source of information pertaining to the changes in American material culture during this early time of industrialization. Despite the importance of the time period and the necessity of taking action to record these increasingly scarce sites, there has been little action on the part of the

archaeological community to acknowledge this. Henry (1995) showed that at the time less than 1% of entries for the National Register of Historic places included 20th century archaeological sites. Reflecting attitudes that archaeologists do not consider these sites valuable and in need of preservation. Perhaps the most work done to record these sites is done through mandated CRM archaeological investigations (e.g. Taylor and Smith 1978; Hanson et al. 1978; Drucker and Fulmer 1981; Anderson and Muse 1981; Anderson et al. 1979).

Faced with these attitudes, it is necessary then for archaeologists to figure out "how to find significant meanings in yesterdays that look so much like today" (Leone and Potter 1988, 372). Twentyfirst century archaeologists may notice that there are increasingly apparent differences between the onset of industrial America in its rural areas and the modern America that is the result of increasingly complex technology. The differences between then and now are growing progressively more evident, as these sites are becoming gradually scarcer. Technological developments in the twenty-first century allows for organ transplants, instantaneous communication with people on the other side of the globe, and the ability to access nearly any information instantly using the internet. This is not the context of mid 19th-20th century life. The invention of the cotton gin, pull tab soda can, mass produced material goods, and improved train networks were just starting to permeate into the these rural southern agrarian regions. The major decrease in populations living on farms from 42% in 1900 to 2% by 1985 shows a significant change marking a transformation encompassing social relations, economy, occupation, settlement patterns, and life ways (Stine 1990). To argue that this past is too recent to study archaeology ignores the different positioning of this time period and our time period in relation to the making of our modern world system. This time period represents the rise of an industrial economy intruding into these southern regions and causing massive social and material changes.

These researchers were arguing the importance of understanding tenant farmer sites in the 1980s and 1990s. As insightful as their comments were then, they are even more so now thirty years later. Yet there has not been any tenant farming related research within these last thirty years. The goal of this thesis is to change this lack of work on tenant farming by examining the tenant farming period in the rural Lowcountry while considering the unique issues and concerns within the archaeology of tenancy. This paper will address how a landscape paradigm is best suited to approaching tenant archaeology, and will use geospatial techniques methodologically to explore tenant farming at Dixie Plantation in Hollywood, SC. By doing this I hope to bring attention to these important sites and contribute to what I hope will be a growing literature on Southern tenancy.

The property today known as Dixie Plantation, located in Hollywood, SC (**Figure 1.1**) has been a site of human habitation since prehistoric periods. Within the historic occupation the site was pivotal to colonial expansion and development, while today its importance lies in preservation, conservation, and education. This research will be examining Dixie Plantation focusing on post-Civil War through the early 20th century occupation during this time tenant farming was widely instituted across Southern rural areas. At Dixie Plantation during this period, the property changed ownership four times leaving distinctive changes to the physical landscape and spatial organization of the property. Succession in property ownership is a catalyst for changes to the landscape (Groover 2004) and these changes in the landscape provide clues for larger cultural adaptations in the region. Utilizing this history of ownership, maps of the property, and historical documents in conjunction with archaeological and geospatial data I begin to piece together a narrative of changing landscape through time and begin to examine the cultural meanings of these changes. The application of digital technology, specifically with GIS, is now being used extensively in landscape archaeology for understanding the spatial relations and patterning of sites and features. It allows for instantaneous and interactive comparisons of data making it a useful tool in

analyzing landscape features and how they relate to the archaeological and historical data. This project uses GIS as a tool for analyzing pedestrian survey in conjunction with archaeological and historical data to understand the landscape as an archaeological feature in hopes of extrapolating information about cultural adaptation, social structure, and changes over time. Historic maps were used as the main way to examine the historical landscape of Dixie Plantation.

II. Property History

Dixie Plantation is owned by the College of Charleston Foundation and functions currently as an off campus living laboratory for the College of Charleston. The property is nearly one thousand acres and is the site of organic gardens, environmental and archaeological projects. Before its modern day transformation into an educational resource though, this area on the Stono River had been occupied for thousands of years. Earliest it was home for various groups of American Indians until the colonization of the Americas. By the end of the 17th the land was claimed for King Charles II and managed by the Lords Proprietors. In the 1680s part of this land was granted to William Peters. Landgrave Edmund Bellinger acquired this and surrounding portions of land. In 1706, Landgrave Bellinger donated thirty-nine acres to St. Paul's Parish. A church, parsonage house, and cemetery were established on this property and have been the focus of most of the archaeological research at Dixie Plantation. The church house experienced some damage during the Yamasee War (1715-1717) but the church was left intact and continued use up into the 1750s (Pyszka et al. 2010, Pyszka et al. 2011, Pyszka 2008).

By the 1790's the Fickling family had planted an avenue of oaks and constructed a home at its head, thus transforming this property into a classic Southern plantation. Approximately five hundred feet to the east of the avenue of oaks was the slave settlement established during this time (1790 and 1807 Map) By 1825 Edward Lynah acquired the property (1825 Mills Atlas). Near the end of the Civil War after a failed attempt to pay his taxes in confederate money, the then owner Benjamin Bailey was forced

to sell the five hundred and thirty four acre property to Frederick Richards for \$4,700 to cover his debts (Buist 1917).

This marks the beginning of the mid-19th to early 20th century time period that is the focus of this study. The 1860 census records show that Frederic Richards and his family resided in downtown Charleston rather than on the property (1860 Census Record). When Frederick Richards died in 1875, his wife, Ann Eliza, inherited the property. Ann Richards died in 1883, leaving the property, referenced as "Dixie Plantation" to her son Frank Richards (Buist 1917). In 1880 Frank Richards is recorded living in Adams Run, ten miles from Dixie Plantation (1880 Census). Additionally he is recorded in the 1890-1891 Carolina Gazetteer and Business Directory as a farmer living in the Wide Awake community two miles from Dixie Plantation (Figure 2.1). Frank Richards passed away around 1910 without heirs causing the will to be contested. As a result the property was sold at auction in 1916. John H. Khonke purchased the property and immediately resold it to George Williams (Buist 1917). In 1918 Williams built a house at the end of the avenue of oaks which an unidentified newspaper source writes was used as a weekend family residence (Anonymous 1937). The property was again put up for sale in 1930. The real estate ad described the house as a "modern three-story brick residence built in 1918 containing 6 masters' bedrooms, sleeping porches, baths. Large living room. Brick garage with servants' quarters" and that the property additionally had "Caretakers' house, barn, and boathouse" (Country Life 1930: 8) (Figure 2.2). In 1935, the now six hundred and thirty one acre property was sold to Mr. and Mrs. Fiermonte from New York, as their winter residence. They made \$30,000 worth of renovations to the property including adding a wooden guest house, a brick garage, a barn, tennis courts, dog track, and skeet field (Anonymous 1937, Anonymous unknown date, Figure 2.3). In a collection of legal records and letters from 1935 - 1936 relating to the sale and transition of the property there is a series of correspondences between Mr. William's lawyer and a tenant on the property, Holly B. Smoak. The

letters discuss arrangements for Mr. Smoak to vacate the property and include his release from the lease and a settlement for the crops he had on the property (Letters 1935-1950). This collection of records also shows that Mrs. Fiermonte was made an offer to start a truck farming operation on the property, but there is no evidence that she ever followed up on it. (Anonymous 1935-1950).

Ms. Force Astor Dick Fiermonte divorced her husband in 1938, and retained the property in their settlement. In December 1938, when Ms. Fiermonte was coming for her winter visit to the property, the coal furnace that had been started in anticipation of her visit burned the house down (The News and Courier 1938:1). Upon her death in 1940, she left the property to her son John Henry Dick. John Henry built his own house and art studio building off center from the avenue of oaks on the location of his mother's guest house, closer to the Stono River. Shortly after building his home, John Henry Dick continued making modifications to the property including reconstructing the dams originally used in rice cultivation to create ponds for wildlife preservation as well as re-digging many of the rice canals to use as drainage for the property. The 1958 plat (**Figure 4.4**) shows the property with the ponds where on previous maps such as 1943, those areas were only marsh with small tidal creeks (**Figure 4.3**). In his journal an undated drawing shows a white, wood frame house near the Avenue of Oaks that served as the residence for his housekeeper Sarah Doctor (John Henry Dick Journals)

After Mrs. Fiermonte purchased the property in 1935, ending tenant farming activity at Dixie Plantation, her actions as well as those of her son, significantly altered the physical landscape of the property. Understanding the changes they made to the property are helpful in our interpretations because it shows how people at the time interacted with the physical markers of tenancy and what changes were made from the original state in order to more effectively extrapolate what the landscape looked like in earlier periods. In this case, the markers of tenancy, or the highly visible material culture like the tenant cabins, are mostly gone from the landscape today except for the two intact cabins that remained in use

up through the late 20th century. The two cabins that do remain were possibly built in the mid-20th century or built earlier.

Other than the records recording Mr. Smoak on the property, there is little historical documentation of the tenants at the property. Potentially early on following the Civil War labor contracts may have been filled with the local Freedman's Bureau which seems to have been common during the Reconstruction period (Schwalm 1997). Further investigation of those types of records has not been conducted since they are located in the National Archives in Washington, DC and not convenient to access.

The historical record of the changes in ownership and to the physical offer some interesting insight and provoke even further questions about what was happening during the time period. The lack of information on the tenant farmers though, makes the role of archaeological investigation even more pertinent. Archaeology fills in gaps in history giving a voice to those underrepresented sections of society.

III. Literature Review

With the termination of slavery at the end of the Civil War, Southern plantation owners were left struggling to find a way to continue to sustain their wealth and status working with this new free labor force. The first solution that evolved was a wage labor system, where freed slaves stayed on the plantation and did much of the same work as before, but were paid a wage for their work (Orser et al.1985, Reid 1973). The wages were often low and a reliance on credit often kept them in debt. This system eventually was reformed and sharecropping and share renting became the new norm (Orser 1985). This new system limited the economic success of small farmers as well as encouraged the overproduction of cotton (Prunty 1955). Cotton was the major agricultural focus up until about 1910, when the destruction brought about by the boil weevil, combined with the economic distress brought

about by the depression, caused major disruptions in cotton production in the United States (Cobb 1936). With the onset of rural modernization following this period of economic turmoil, the need for sharecroppers and tenant farmers began to decrease dramatically as mechanized machinery replaced the need for human labor (Cabbak et al 1999). Additionally beginning around the turn of the century large numbers of people began to migrate from the rural to urban areas in search of better work, contributing to the massive decrease of the percentage of American's working on farms (Anderson and Muse 1982).

Though there has been comparatively little research done on this period, there is a small body of archaeological literature that begins to examine tenant farming. In the 1980s researchers reference a nascent interest in studying tenancy as a transitional period. Federal legislation enacted in the 1970's relating to mandatory cultural resource management on sites being affected by federal projects meant that many more archaeologists had to examine these tenant farming sites as part of this new data recovery (Orser 1985). Other researchers have noted that the increased scarcity of these resources had prompted their research in hopes of bringing attention to the time period within the archaeological community (Anderson and Muse 1982). As mentioned previously, many archaeologists have recognized that tenant sites are rapidly disappearing from the American rural landscape. Some reasons given for this phenomena is that the tenant cabins are often removed to reduce taxes on the property, clear room for intensified, mechanized agriculture (Anderson and Muse 1982), or often are destroyed by expanding development (Wilson 1990). Without these corresponding structures, tenant sites can be located using oral interview data, historic documents, and maps (Holland 1990). It is likely that even without the corresponding structures these sites will still be archaeologically visible, sub-surface, due to the presence of in-filled wells or privies (Anderson and Muse 1982). Some archaeologists note light artifact assemblages which could be related to preservation conditions or post-abandonment land use practices. While other archaeologists have offered alternate explanations of this pattern citing ethnographic and

historical records which indicate tenants often reused items as much as possible, and when they moved they took everything with them, leaving very little remaining at the site (Trinkley 1983). According to Woofter et al. (1936) tenant farmers moved frequently and in South Carolina African-American tenant farmers moved every six years or so. However, other research indicates that this may not be the case. In a critical reexamination of their previous work and other scholarly work Anderson and Muse (1983) discuss a number of projects which did discover a significant number of archaeological materials in relationship to late 19th century and early 20th century occupation. Two tenant sites investigated in South Carolina (Trinkley and Caballero 1935a Trinkley and Caballero; 1983b) uncovered hundreds of artifacts and high sheet midden densities. Additionally, research conducted by Moir (1982) on refuse disposal patterns of early 20th century tenant homes in Texas also indicates the potential for high archaeological visibility of these sites. Anderson and Muse (1983) indicate that factors affecting the visibility of these sites often relate to post-use land management practices. There is also the consideration of what refuse disposal patterns were like during time of occupation that may impact how these sites appear archaeologically today. Anderson and Muse (1982) suggest that using debris as backfill for wells or privies may be one of the biggest sources of archaeological materials relating to this time period. There have also been other considerations of how waste disposal practices may have affected site visibility in the archaeological record (Holland 1990). There is some photographic evidence of tenants having clean yards (Agee and Evans 1941) and it has been suggested that tenants often swept debris under the house structure or removed it to another location (Adams 1980). Further critical examination of refuse disposal patterns would be necessary to validate these claims.

Orser (1985) argues that historical archaeology is particularly well suited to study tenant farming in the southeast due to its ability to combine various sources of information including oral interviews, historical information, and discarded material culture. A variety of methods, theories, and questions

have been used and addressed but the lack of cohesive ideas suggest that there is very little archaeologists empirically know about this time period and that greater attention should be brought to uniting the discipline behind this topic. When enumerating the types of questions in need of investigation regards to tenant sites and life ways, the ideas archaeologists propose are relatively simple facts of daily life. Holland (1990) suggests that archaeologists should investigate settlement, privies, trash disposal, acquisition of material culture, and food procurement, consumption and disposal. These are questions that simply seek to discover what the daily lives of tenants were like. Cabak and Inkrot (1996) also address questions relating to the basic lifestyle of people during this period by examining the architectural styles of tenant worker and farm operator houses. Their work is mainly meant to catalogue the differences in life style and serve as a guide for archaeologists able to identify if a structure may be a tenant structure or the farm operator. The little that is understood about tenant material culture and life style is often based less on archaeology and more on Depression-era sociological work, notably Agee and Evans (1941) who recorded lives of three white tenant farmers and their families. This ethnographic data is advocated for use in archaeology by numerous archaeologists (e.g. Holland 1990, Brown 2004, Adams 1980). Some of these archaeologists complete their own ethnographic studies, while some are reliant on previous work conducted (e.g. Agee and Evans 1941; Woofter et al. 1936). While ethnography does add a dimension of meaning to archaeological data as Anderson and Muse (1982) note gathering qualitative data from living tenant farmers will not be possible within a few generations, and they wrote that thirty-three years ago. This is quickly becoming an impossible recommendation for archaeologists to consider. Looking at what information has already been collected may be possible, but seems unlikely that most researchers would have access to ethnographic data relating to their site. In addition to using ethnographic data to enrich site interpretations, some archaeologists also indicate that it is useful in site identification (Holland 1990).

The perceived difficulty of understanding and locating these sites has led some researchers to advocate for ethnographic analysis in attempting to understand tenant sties and their lives (Holland 1990; Brown and Cooper 1990; Brown 2004). Using oral interview data in conjunction with historical records and the archaeological record could be an effective way to begin to understand the "webs of meaning" or cultural constructions that govern how people live and interact (Geertz 1973). Though trying to critically examine cultural and economic variables in the material culture is an important aspect. Frequently, these sites are examined at the household and community levels (see Bruseth and Moir 1987; Orser 1985; Adams 1980) by looking at the individual households and the overall property to understand that particular site. Archaeologists have frequently looked to the household as the most basic unit of the human species. The household is considered by researchers to be the center of daily work and leisure activity, and reflects economic and social symbolic behavior of the cultural landscape (Deetz 1977).

There has also been discussion between scholars as to how to approach this topic theoretically. Mainly, Stine (1990) who advocates a social stratification approach and Cabak, Inkrot, and Grover (1999) who proposes farm modernization as a theoretical model. Stine (1990) is interested in material culture in its forms and stages of utilization which reflects the cultural changes occurring during this dynamic era. She argues that by looking at material culture connected to rural life and farming a unified perspective that incorporates the interplay between social and economic factors during this time can be created. Though there is not a very clear way to adapt socio-economic indices to interpretation of data since there is not a clear way to measure the validity of the system (Stine 1990). Socioeconomic status is a "hard-science sounding term which achieves its quantifiability as a 'variable' by fudging complexities" (Fallers 1973; 3). Thus achieving a unified perspective that examines only socioeconomic status may be more complex than Stine suggests. Tumin (1970: 14) defines social stratification as the

"hierarchical ordering of the members of a society into strata according to several criteria of rank". These characteristics relate to power, status, and economics (Gordon 1963). Stine (1990) defines ethnic groups, as self-aware and having shared characteristics, and racial groups, as not self-aware are often imposed by other groups or researchers and suggests that these different designations and the interplay between them may be reflected in social ranking. As occupational ranking is often part of social stratification (Gordon 1963) the agrarian hierarchical structure of the 20th century, the "agricultural ladder" (Table 3.1) is also a factor of social-stratification. Sharecropping and share renting are two of the major distinctions on this ladder, which are defined based on their type of payment arrangement with the landowner (Stine 1990). The sharecropper paid a portion of the crops to the land owner as payment for use of land, housing, tools, work animals, and half of the fertilizer. Share renting required the landowner only to supply housing, land, and part of the fertilizer which would determine how much of the crop the landowner received (Brannen 1924). Additionally landowners could have had a cash renting arrangement where the laborer supplied their own goods; the landowner supplied the house and land in exchange for a fixed price (Boeger and Goldenweiser 1916). Similar to cash renting was standing renting where rent was paid in a fixed amount of a crop (Brannen 1924). During the late 19th and early 20th century, brought about by the end of the slave based economy of the South was a new system of hierarchical organization called the "agricultural ladder" that was not based on relation to means of production and credit. (Stine 1990, 38) The system would later be formalized during Depression-era internalization from census data and sociological research and eventually came to symbolize economic strata and related connotations of social inequality (Stine 1990). A mid-20th century study of a rural North Carolina tenant area demonstrated that here most individuals moved down the ladder, those at the top usually began there, highlighting the lack of upward mobility. The system allowed land-owners to claim land for non-payment of debts, and the systems of credit kept workers in a cycle of debt which

kept them from gaining financial independence (Hamilton 1937). Though some researchers have argued that farmers were not necessarily prosecuted through this system of credit, but it kept them from acquiring wealth to purchase their own land and thus they would move every few years or so in order to try and find hopefully new employment that would allow them to achieve financial independence Woofter et al. (1936). Archaeological repercussions of social rank change add to the even further complexity of the variation seen at tenant sites, across both space and time. Tenant houses were often occupied by different families every five years on average, and the families living in these houses could have had different rankings on the agricultural ladder. This may be possible for archaeologists to investigate in the material culture by looking at patterns and trends regionally (Stine 1990). An example of a study using this perspective of social-stratification to address tenancy was conducted in Richland Creek, Texas which examined data from thirty-two sites looking for a correlation between material culture and ladder position. They sought to distinguish between white landowners and black landowners, and distinguish between owners and tenants. The tests could not distinguish race between tenants, and also found that assemblages of African-American owners matched those of white tenants and not necessarily African American tenant of white owners (R. Stine 1989). The purpose of examining the ladder system is to see how closely occupation determined economic success or how much ladder position related to social status (Stine 1990). What research by R. Stine (1989) indicates is that connections between ladder position and race as seen in material culture is Hagood (1977) argues that social status does not always directly relate to esteem in the community and that looking solely at economic variables is not sufficient to address all the aspects of social stratification. Race, as suggested earlier may also be a variable for addressing stratification. Though when researchers focus on the race of the people they are studying they are making assumptions about "linking the simple dichotomies of black/white, poor/wealthy, and owner/tenant" (Stine 1990, 41). Though work like R. Stine's (1989)

shows that these classifications, poor and rich, black and white, are not sufficient enough to explain the social dynamic at the time. The assumptions equating cheap goods with poor, African-American tenant farmers leads to generalizations that anytime the assemblage consists of inexpensive goods that it resulted from a poor black tenant occupation and overly simplified ideas about racial relations and quality of life at the site. Opposite of this, expensive goods or a rich assemblage are perceived to indicate wealth which indicates assumptions about power and community relations (Stine 1990). Stratification is a complex designation and involves a combination of both social and economic factors (Riordan 1985). Overall, "twentieth-century rural sites were farmed by blacks and white whose positions on the agricultural ladder tended to rise and fall with varied circumstances" (Stine 1990; 49). Early to mid-20th century social organization is much more complex than a simple reduction to material wealth. Though economic variables were important in determining access to goods, evidence of social inequality is discoverable in direct and indirect effects of social stratification within a community. Looking at larger scale data may prove however, to reveal patterns on a larger level than may be apparent at the site level because it shows overall trends in material culture relating to social relationships and stratification rather than particular small scale data (Stine 1990).

Highest Ranking	Owner, Part-owner (no mortgage)
	Owner, Part-owner (mortgage)
	Share, cash, standing renter
	Sharecropper
	Day laborer
	Paid Laborer, cropper, tenant (family farm)
Lowest Ranking	Unpaid family laborer

Table 3.1 – The Agricultural Ladder (Hamilton 1937, 74; Stine 1990, 39)

The second major approach considers farm modernization as a theoretical model and argues that it could potentially function as an interpretive framework for late 19th and early 20th century sites (Cabak et al. 1999). The similarities of material culture among different ethnic groups, economic classes, and regions as discussed by Stine (1990), is "undoubtedly a consequence of the cultural homogeneity and standardization wrought by the nation's emerging industrialization and consumerism" (Cabak, et al. 1999). They argue that taking a view of modernization, not social stratification, could help to better understand the archaeological record which is likely highly influenced by the industrialization that began to occur between the middle and late 19th century since industrialization and the increasingly consumer oriented culture are processes of modernization (Cabak et al. 1999) The material basis of a modernization framework addresses the basis of archaeology which is material culture. Specifically for addressing farmstead archaeology, a modernization framework is appropriate for several reasons. The restructuring of the rural landscape because of advances and increasing popularity of mechanized agriculture caused a significant shift in labor and rural class structures. The mechanization of agriculture

caused significant demographic shifts as well specifically among the non-landowning groups. Additionally, the mechanization of agriculture caused changes in rural architecture and spatial arrangement of farmlands and related structures. Industrial innovations led to the development of American consumer culture, or mass consumption, which in turn transformed rural households and restructured rural subsistence and consumption practices (Cabak et al. 1999). In the archaeological record changes to rural architecture and material culture of consumerism reflect these transitions. The early 20th century demographic shifts due to increasing modernization of America led to a restructuring of farm life and attitudes on what it meant to be a successful agriculturalist. Capitalist over productivity targeted farmers through literature and media to convince them of the necessity of technological innovations in successful farming (Cabak et al. 1999).

Other research on tenant farming has focused less on the framework for studying the site, and more on addressing the archaeological and historical materials. One early study, in 1980, as a result of the new mandatory CRM legislation was a study at Millwood Plantation. This site is especially interesting because it was owned and operated by the same owner before, during, and after the Civil War (Orser 1985). This is significant because changes in ownership act as a catalyst for changes in the landscape (Groover 2004). This means that as property changes ownership, the new owners of the land are likely to make changes to the property. New ownership facilitates new additions or changes to the landscape and represents new ideas about land use. At Millwood Plantation, having the same owner before and after does not eliminate the possibility of landscape change, but it does help by reducing some variability in what is causing changes to the landscape. Rather than being limited to saying that changes in the property were caused by new ownership and possibly changing ideas, at this site there is the ability to look more closely at how the overall changing social landscape of the time was impacting the site because there are fewer variables. Furthermore, a fire of an occupied tenant cabin allowed

archaeologists to get a better examination of daily tenant life since the site was abandoned and much of the material culture assemblage was left intact. This gave them a deeper examination of daily tenant life at this site. The greatest proportion of the artifact assemblage was related to architectural remains, 51% of the total material included nails, hinges, latches, bolts, and other architectural pieces. The second largest group recovered, 41% of the total assemblage, related to floodways, signifying an importance or focus on procurement, preparation, and storage of food. Bottle glass represented 66% of the foodways related items. Ceramics only represented 4% of the foodways related artifacts. The rest of the assemblage included personal items relating to music, clothing, and toys. Additionally, certain groups of artifacts were found in association with specific rooms in the house signifying division of work and play areas. This study was further supplemented with oral interviews from one of the inhabitants of this site. Her comments on the use and layout of the site matched archaeological data, most interesting was her discussion of the end of the use of the site as a tenant community. She discussed the increasing friction between people who still lived at the site and those who used the site recreationally. She also gave a personal narrative of the fire that destroyed the house causing them to move to a different location (Orser 1985). Orser (1985) argues that oral interviews alone would be a one-dimensional view of the site, but combined with archaeological data it adds personal meaning to the interpretations.

Many have argued (Orser 1985, Holland 1990, Brown 2004; Brown and Cooper 1990) that informant interviews and oral data should be incorporated with archaeological data to enrich the interpretations of material culture. This ethnoarchaeological approach involves the comparison of ethnographic and archaeological data (Stiles 1977). When attempting to understand tenant farmers, people who have been living and working on plantations and then transitioning into life as freed men and women, one needs to consider that they have been undergoing cultural interaction and change over a long period of time. Some researchers suggest that there may be many similarities between what is now

the Gullah/Geechee culture and the tenant culture in other places throughout the rural southeast (Brown 2004). In his case study of the Levi Jordan Plantation Tenant Community, located in Texas, Brown (2004) demonstrates several ways that ethnographic information relating to Gullah/Geechee culture can be applied to explain archaeological irregularities encountered on African-American tenant site relating especially to religious practice and ritual. Holland (1990) advocates for the use of oral information relating directly to the site as a way to develop an archaeological framework for investigation and interpretation. Her work advocates for oral interviews with informants linked to the site either as descendants or those who were working there. She mentions three kinds of ethnographic data (as described by Gould 1971; White 1977; and Stiles 1977) that can be gathered from informant interviews: data about details of landscape use and layout, interpretive data about artifact acquisition and use, and general interpretive data relating to larger cultural traits of the group. However, even in the late 20th century this would have been difficult to accomplish, as people move around and many tenant farmers were consolidated into large mechanized farms. By present time, finding a site and non-landowning informants with a connection to it would be unique.

Previous research that is heavily based on ethnographic data has relied heavily on informant interview, description, and photographic documentation from mainly around the mid-20th century. Their work has been used to support several hypotheses about tenant life and material cultural that archaeologists should further examine to determine their validity. For example, Agee and Evans (1969) make many statements about the poverty and consumption patterns of tenants stating that tenants rarely purchased new goods, they purchased ceramics as individual pieces not sets, and that nearly nothing is thrown away. Archaeologists (e.g. Trinkley 1983) have accepted many of these points uncritically. Agee and Evans (1969) were focusing on only three white tenant farming families closer to the time period of the Great Depression. It would be overly simplistic and deny the changing nature of culture to

uncritically accept that these statements also apply to all tenant farmers in the South following the end of the Civil War. While the observations by Agee and Evans (1969) and further reinforced by archaeologists may be valid for Depression Era white tenant farmers, researchers need to be more cautious when trying to apply these statements to different time periods in different regions. The changing nature of culture does not make them completely irrelevant, likely there are many similarities, but it does require a certain amount of skepticism on the part of the researcher. The Reconstruction era and the Great Depression era are different cultural landscapes that people were living in, many technological, social, and political changes had taken place by this point. Archaeologists should recognize that ethnographic information from during the Great Depression is not describing the same people as from post-Civil War. Also even though some work has shown that there is actually less variation between ethnic groups of tenant farmers at the same position on the agricultural ladder, but more between positions on the ladder, it is important to note that there may be implications relating to ethnicity and racial inequality that are lacking from applying ethnography of white tenants to all tenants At Dixie Plantation, there were not any known informants that were available for interview though in future work surviving descendents of the Williams family may provide some insight into how the property. Without ethnographic sources to help determine site location and give insight into the tenant farming period, other methods were employed to locate tenant houses, discover changes on the landscape, and attempt to understand tenant life and culture here.

IV. Previous Research

Ongoing research has at Dixie Plantation has addressed a number of historical and archaeological questions specific to the Colonial and Plantation occupations of the property. This has revealed much information relating to the transition of the property throughout the historical time period beginning when the land was donated for the St. Paul's Parrish Glebe in 1706, to becoming a privately

owned rice plantation by the 1790's, to its latest metamorphosis as a nature preserve and outdoor classroom. Previous archaeology conducted at Dixie Plantation has manly explored the Anglican church and parsonage house and the early 18th century (Pyszka et al. 2010; Pyszka et al. 2011, Pyszka a 2012; Pyszka b 2012, Pyszka 2014). Additionally, some recent work has also focused on the Plantation period and excavations in 2012 sought to determine location and site function of the slave settlement (Falls 2014). Shovel testing in 2012 examined the fields surrounding the location of the slave settlement as shown on the 1807 plat. These tests also revealed information about the decline in the use of the slave settlement and transition to tenant housing in the early 19th century. In 2007, shovel testing of Area B in the open area in front of Structure 2 identified an area of artifact densities. The brick, nail, and ceramic density in the same area, consistent with the location of one of the tenant houses on the 1919 USGS map.

V. Methods

A landscape archaeology paradigm is highly effective in addressing archaeological questions because of its ability to unite a variety of approaches under the common goal of understanding the physical and cultural landscapes of the group or area of study and will be used in this research. A landscape archaeology paradigm is a "set of working assumptions, procedures, and findings that define a pattern of inquiry about the nature of our knowledge of the world or some aspect of the world" (Anschuetz et al 2001, 160). When approaching landscape archaeology this paradigm methodologically provides archaeologists with a set of defined approaches for addressing the interpretation of the spatial landscape use (Masterman 1970). "In particular…a landscape approach helps contribute to the building of fuller understandings of relationships among the varied spatial, temporal, ecological, and cognitive contexts in which people creatively interact with their environments." (Anschuetz et al 2001, 164).

Changing cultural processes inevitably affect landscape, resulting in a changing landscape over time and space. (Anschuetz et al 2001). Thus landscape change is a cultural process that reflects the beliefs and ideologies of the people who interacted with their environment daily. By examining culture and the landscape together, archaeologists can gain a thorough and meaningful interpretation of the archaeological record set in the context of cultural understandings of landscape use. Human occupation, alteration, and modification to landscape are continuous. Rather than looking at one place as a snap shot in time, a landscape approach takes into consideration what came before, how it may have changed during the time period of interest, and how it continued to be reformed after. In this view landscape refers to both the physical landscape including the built structures, material culture, features all contained within a specific environmental context, as well as the cultural landscape which includes networks of relationships, patterns of human behavior, and social ideology. Of particular interest to the archaeologists is in determining patterns and changes in cultural patterns through examination of the material remains of the physical landscape in addition to recovered material culture.

In examining the spatial and cultural landscape of Dixie Plantation during the tenant period I used GIS analysis in conjunction with archaeological testing, pedestrian survey, and historical research to begin to see how evidence in the landscape may reveal underlying cultural changes following the end of the Civil-War up to the Great Depression Era.

GIS

Using ArcMAP 10.0, an Esri Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software platform I was able to condense these multiple types of data (archaeological, historical, and spatial) into a single system that allowed for interactive and simultaneous comparison of features across space and time. I began by georeferencing and digitizing the plats and maps into the system which allowed me to spatially catalogue features including houses, fields, roads, train tracks, and other structures from all different

time periods onto modern satellite imagery which was then used in locating sites during the pedestrian survey, as well as in helping with the analysis of the landscape (**Figure 5.1**).

When digitized markers are created for features on the landscape, it also records the geographical locations of these markers. The GPS coordinates can then be collected from the map and used in conjunction with a handheld GPS to locate specific points from the map. Another way this can be accomplished is through using smart phones in conjunction with the Esri ArcGIS application (**Figure 5.2.**). The Esri Online Map allows users to upload features digitized in the ArcMAP program to a simplified web-based version. Maps that users create in Esri Online can be accessed via the smart phone application in the field. It functions like a GPS at that point and the user can use their position, which is shown on the phone, to navigate to features shown loaded on to their web based map. This method was used successfully in locating Ruin 3 during the pedestrian survey. This method also helped in ground-truthing the locations of the other known structures and ruins by allowing us to compare their location on the map with their actual location on the landscape to check for accuracy of the digitization which showed an approximate five meter discrepancy in location.

Data collected from the pedestrian survey, including location of dumps and newly discovered ruins (**Figure 5.3**), were also added to the map using GPS coordinates. Additionally, data from the STP testing in Area B (**Figure 5.4**) and location of test units from archaeological investigation in 2014 (**Figure 5.5**) were added to the maps in order to spatially reference ongoing archaeological work and put it in context of the other features and structures plotted on the map. Density maps created in Surfer and overlaid onto Google Maps were used to determine unit locations the 2014 archaeological investigation. Using the georeferenced density map to identify GPS position for the center of the densest area hypothesized to be the location of a structure. The dense area from the 2008 STP testing corresponded with the georeferenced and digitized location of the cabin that appeared on the 1919 USGS plat (**Figure**

5.6). A second unit was excavated behind Structure 1 as a comparison for the material culture. If Structure 1 was the original circa 1912 building and had never been demolished the material culture between the two units may have certain patterned differences since the other structure was demolished at some point after 1919.

Some issues are apparent when using GIS to address historical sites. Since many of these features are no longer present on the landscape, documenting their location using historical sources and maps can have slight inaccuracy due to satellite or mapping errors. However, this method is still useful in spatial analysis because the location of structures can be analyzed without precise location. The main difficulty in using historic maps for georeferencing is that landscape features move, are created, or removed over time. Buildings, roads, and natural elements that are visible on the modern satellite imagery may not have existed during the time the map was made. Elements on the map may no longer exist in the present. Thus finding consistent points between the modern satellite imagery and the historic map may be the biggest challenge having a sense of where things on the map were originally located using GPS coordinates may be the only way some historic maps may be georeferenced. At Dixie Plantation, there were enough stable elements in the landscape that persisted throughout time and into the present such as the avenue of oaks, roads, and the dock. Or elements that left a visible mark on the environment even though they no longer exist today, such as the railroad track which leaves a visible mark across the satellite imagery.

The second problem with using GIS is one of scale. GIS is best suited to look at larger areas instead of very small sites. Though it is possible to look at a very small scale, the satellite imagery will not be very comprehensible once the scale becomes too small. If the satellite imagery is not important for the study, by simply adding the basemap but turning the view off the archaeologist can still work within the geographical coordinates and can avoid looking at blurry satellite images. This also can be

addressed by georeferencing high quality aerial imagery to the area of study which will allow the researcher to work at much smaller scale than the satellite imagery is capable of producing. Dixie Plantation is a large enough area that the site was able to be studied without too much concern about the scale. However, addition of high quality aerial photography of this area would further increase the amount of detail that could be extrapolated from the physical landscape by providing a high resolution view at a small scale of the property. Potentially leading to identification of new features on the property, especially in dense mostly uninvestigated forested areas as human habitation leaves marks on the natural environment and these may still be apparent from an aerial perspective.

Archaeology

To supplement historical data, GIS, and survey data archaeological testing was also conducted. This also collected information on tenant material culture in relation to two known tenant house locations. Two 5x5 feet units were dug in Area B, one at the center of the density from the 2007 shovel tests and the other behind the standing structure. Both units were excavated stratigraphically, stopping at subsoil; here the subsoil is a bright yellow, sandy layer that is easily distinguished from the plow zone.

Historical Research

In addition to the spatial analysis and field work, historical records relating to Dixie Plantation were examined. The maps were the most critical part of the historical research and provided information on the spatial arrangement at different points in time. Historic deeds and titles were examined in previous research (Pyszka 2008, Pyszka et al. 2010; Pyszka et al. 2011, Pyszka a 2012; Pyszka b 2012, Pyszka 2014) and provided much of the information to understand the various changes in ownership and provide context for our archaeological observations. Legal documents housed with the South Carolina Historical Society provided information about the end of the tenant period when the Williams sold the property to the Fieremontes.

VI. Results

GIS, Historic Documents, Maps, and Plats

The observations relating to the changing material landscape over the various periods at Dixie Plantation were facilitated with the use of GIS analysis. Each of these maps was transformed into a digital version, as discussed in the Methods section, which allowed for the creation of a digital database that recorded the changes over time. This resulted in the creation of a number of maps used to aid in making interpretations of changes occurring over time.

While very early, the 1807 plat (**Figure 1.3**) provides insight into the modified historical landscape before the beginning of the tenant period. It records the location of the slave settlement, the dirt roads on the property, and the Avenue of Oaks. Especially when looking at the transition out of slavery at the end of the Civil War, this information is important to inform observations of Dixie Plantation during the tenant phase. Having the knowledge of the location of the previous slave settlement area provides context for the development of the tenant housing away from this area and to other locations on the property, and what the meaning of these shifts are.

The earliest plat from the tenant farmer period dates to 1912 (**Figure 1.4**). This plat was used to interpret what the property may have looked like during the Richards' ownership, 1867-1910. This plat records three tenant structures near the Avenue of Oaks and central structure area. There is also possibly one structure on the other side of Willtown road that may be on Dixie Plantation property as well. The only known map made during the Williams ownership from 1916-1935, is the 1919 USGS map (**Figure 1.5**). There are a number of later USGS maps that were used to infer what changes the Williams may have made to the landscape. Since the 1919 map dates early in the ownership possibly it records more of what the previous landscape looked like, and less of what changes the Williams may have made. This

map was created from a 1918 survey conducted by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey in conjunction with the U.S. War Department. Later USGS maps include the USGS 1944 map Version A (Figure 1.6) and Version B (Figure 1.7). Each of these maps was based off the 1918 survey and 1919 map. The 1944 Version A was revised from single lens vertical aerial photographs taken by the Department of Agriculture in 1941. Version B is not updated and matches the 1919 USGS map. The B Version shows the same image of the property as the 1919 map, since it was not updated. The Version A map was updated with 1941, but this map shows very few structures on the property which I do not think indicates that there were no structures then, because later more detailed plats show the continued existence of structures from the 1912 and 1918 maps, as well as show new structures that would not have likely been built after the tenant period ended at Dixie Plantation in 1935. These two later plats dating to 1948 (Figure 1.8) and 1952 (Figure 1.9) show greater detail of the property following the tenant farming period at Dixie Plantation. There are six new structures that were not seen on the 1912 or 1919 maps, and one structure that was seen on the 1912 and 1919 maps. These structures that appear for the first time on the 1948 map that were not seen on the earlier 1912 or 1919 maps were likely built when the Williams owned the property (1916-1935). It is not likely the Fieremontes built tenant housing because they did not have any tenant farming occurring on the property since they purchased it in 1935.

It is interesting that these visible markers of tenancy at Dixie Plantation did stay on property through the Fiermonte ownership, and some even up until present day. Often markers of tenancy, mainly the tenant homes, are removed from the landscape to clear room for mechanized agricultural production (Cabak et al 1999), decrease property taxes (Anderson and Muse 1982), or due to land development (Wilson 1990). The record at Dixie Plantation of where cabins were located later on in the history of the land use not only informs our interpretations of how the property transitioned into the 20th century and industrialization, but also it records the locations of features aiding in decision making in archaeological investigation. In addition to the houses indicated on the map, some auxiliary structures were also seen constant over time. The barn that had been on the property at least since the Richards period, if not earlier, is recorded on the 1912 plat (**Figure 6.1**) but was torn down in 2013. The Avenue of Oaks, dirt roads, and general field areas seem to stay consistent over time. There is also the later symbol of modernization, the railroad and railroad truck spur which run adjacent to and cut through parts of the property (**Figure 6.2**). The railroad first appears on the 1919 USGS map (**Figure 5.6**) and the truck spur is first seen on the 1943 map (**Figure 6.4**). Historical records indicate that was railroad built in 1917 (Property Deed 1917).

Survey

Based on the examination of the maps a pedestrian survey was conducted to ground truth and collect more data about the remaining landscape. During the Richards ownership, by 1912 (**Figure 6.5**) two cabins were located on the west side of the avenue of oaks. Archaeological testing (Pyszka 2008) and pedestrian survey did not uncover an evidence of these structures. In addition to two more on the east side of the Avenue of Oaks and one on the opposite side of Willtown road. Archaeological testing of the two on the East side was conducted and is discussed below. Pedestrian survey recorded information on the standing structure (Structure 2) (**Figure 6.7**) on the east side of the avenue which is still standing. This is important because this house was likely constructed in 1912, the earliest part of the tenant farming period and potentially is an example of what the other houses looked like. Structure 2 is a wood-frame, side gabled building. Nearly all tenant structures in South Carolina were wood frame construction (Woofter et al, 1936). Nearly half of all tenant structures in South Carolina were rated as poor condition for walls, chimney, ceiling, floors, windows, or screens which is about double of the national average during the mid-20th century (United States Department of Agriculture 1939, Table 6).

It is not clear if this is also the case at Dixie Plantation. The house is still standing and actually has remained in use following the tenant period as housing for John Henry Dick's servant Sarah Doctor and up to today as a field laboratory. The consistent use of the structure has preserved it for our observations and if it is the original structure it is one hundred and three years old. Though it is not currently in good condition, it is possible that this may be attributed to age.

Structure 2 is the only structure relating to the Richards ownership. The rest of the remaining material landscape relates to the later Williams ownership. They include Structure 1 (Figure 6.8) and three ruins of houses. Like Structure 2, Structure 1 is constructed on brick piers with a central brick chimney that has two openings into adjacent rooms and an exhaust into the third room for the kitchen. Both buildings are side-gabled, common in the South from the mid-19th to mid-20th century (McAlester and McAlester 1984). They are rectangle shaped, with three rooms, and an incised porch. Two of the three ruins (Figure 6.10 and 6.11) relating to this later period, or potentially even later, are located near Structure 1, and are seen on the 1943 (Figure 6.3) and 1958 map (Figure 6.9). These three houses are all located near a natural spring that may have been used during their occupation. Since none of these buildings had running water, even Structure 1, which was also later occupied by John Henry Dicks' groundskeeper during his ownership of the property. The two ruins in this area consist of brick piers and chimneys (Figure 6.12). The chimneys are different styles than in the two standing structures with openings on opposite sides rather than adjacent like in the two standing structures (Figure 6.13). The ruin further to the south (Ruin 1) has a more intact brick pier layout while the one closest to the spring (Ruin 2) only has a few intact brick piers. All three areas are associated with heavy, surface debris deposits including liquor bottles, beer cans, soda bottles and cans, jars for canning food, bottles from cleaning products, mattress springs, a refrigerator, a car hood, several pots, shoes, and many other unidentifiable items (Figure 6.14). Without further archaeological investigation it is uncertain the time

range of these deposits or if they continue into subsurface deposits. Structure 2 also has a much less extensive, but similarly patterned surface dump area to the north (**Figure 6.15**). The third brick ruin (Ruin 3) relating to the Williams ownership was discovered to the north-west of the property near the ponds (**Figure 6.16**). Ruin 3 also had a seemingly intact brick pier foundation, though there were no remains of any chimney. This ruin measured the same as the two standing structures, 27x23 feet long with the same four by four pier arrangement. This structure appears on the 1943 map labeled "TH" suggesting it was built during the Williams period. The 1943 map also shows that there were three houses in this area at the same time, though pedestrian survey did not find any other obvious surface materials relating to them except for the one set of brick piers. The addition of the ponds, seen on the 1958 plat (**Figure 6.9**), during John Henry Dick's ownership may have caused disturbances to the materials, destruction or covering up of remains, or the other two were simply removed.

Archaeology

For this research, only two test units were excavated to look at patterns of material culture in association with known tenant house locations. Unit 85 had only two distinct stratigraphic layers. The top soil yielded no artifacts. The plow zone was the most archaeologically rich containing 350g of brick and 89 machine-cut nails. A total of 94 sherds were recovered including olive-green, aqua, dark olive-green, amber, amethyst, cobalt blue, clear, and opaque bottle types. 46 historic ceramic sherds were recovered mainly whiteware but also including ironstone, pearlware, anularware, stone ware, and American Rockingham ware. Light faunal remains including a partial boar tusk were also found. No window glass was recovered from this unit. This unit yielded 271 total artifacts, the larger archeological assemblage of the two units. As no features were identified no photographs were taken.

Unit 87 had three distinct stratigraphic layers. Light amounts of architectural artifacts including machine-cut nails, roofing material, evidence of blue paint, and very light brick debris were recovered.

Less than 100grams of brick were found in level 2 and 3. In level 2 19 nails were found, 36 window glass sherds, and 56 bottle glass sherds were found. There were no historic ceramics in level 2. In level 3 there were 2 nails, 5 glass sherds, and 2 historic ceramic sherds. As no features were identified no photographs were taken. 229 total artifacts were recovered from both level 2 and level 3.

Other archaeological evidence from previous research at Dixie Plantation also provides clues to the timing of the shift in tenant structure location. At the former slave settlement plain, undecorated whitewares, whitewares decorated with decals, gilding, or flow blue, yellowwares, Rockingham wares, Bristol-glazed stonewares, and amethyst glass are indicative of a post-1860 occupation. However, the lack of machine made bottles and a relatively small amount of wire nails (37 of 138 identifiable nails) suggest the occupation ended ca. 1900. Therefore, the shift in tenant house location likely took place ca. 1900 to 1912. The 1912 map and structure 2 indicate that the early shift in tenant housing moved over towards the Avenue of Oaks.

Some research, in examining transition from slavery to tenancy on other plantations, has also noted continuity in use of slave cabins post-bellum with eventual shifting to new buildings (Brown and Cooper 1990). It is possible the slave houses continued to be used initially for tenant farmer housing at Dixie Plantation as well. While currently there are no known existing plats dating from 1866-1912, archaeological evidence fills the gap providing clues to the timing of the shift in tenant structure location. Shovel testing the area adjacent to the former slave settlement, in front of an existing tenant house, revealed a ceramic assemblage indicative of a post-1860 occupation. Coupled with the lack of machine made bottles and a relatively low number of wire nails suggest the occupation in this area temporarily ended ca. 1900.

The 1912 plat indicates that there were three house structures west of the Avenue of Oaks.

Between 1912 and 1918 more structures were added east of the avenue of oaks and near the central barn and natural spring (**Figure 6.17**). Archaeological investigation of Area B, where Structure 2 is located, indicated an area of artifact density that may signify were the second structure added east of the avenue was located (**Figure 5.6**). The USGS map from 1919 (**Figure 5.6**) show a structure was located here in addition to Structure 2. The end of an occupation in this area in front of Structure 2 is further supported by the disappearance of this structure on any maps following 1919. Excavations behind Structure 2, in the same area, revealed a light artifact assemblage mainly relating to architectural and kitchen uses. Potentially that house is a renovated version of the one seen on maps since 1912 (**Figure 6.1**) from the Richards' family ownership (1866-1916). There has been no uncovered archaeological or historical evidence of a house on the property during the Richard's ownership. Historical references indicate that the Richards lived in Adams Run and later Wide Awake. On the 1912 map (**Figure 6.18**) there is a series of three buildings located at the end of the Avenue of Oaks showing a cluster of centrally located structures.

The material landscape overall included a changing number of tenant houses, landowner structures, and several larger more permanent landscape features. In the earliest period, there were four tenant houses located on the property, as evidenced by maps and archaeological investigation, between 1866 and 1919. These houses, probably built ca. 1900, coupled with the series of central structures that included the barn are attributed to the Richards ownership. During the Williams ownership beginning in 1916 a number of structures were added to the landscape, Housing indicated on the 1943 map which was likely added during the William's ownership shows four structures on the west end of the property near the truck crop spur, two structures by the natural spring, and one early structure from the 1912 map, (Structure 2) located near the Avenue of Oaks (**Figure 6.6**). These structures are all away from the

former slave settlement and Avenue of Oaks where the truck crop spur is shown on the 1942 map. This coupled with the archaeological data supports a shift in tenant house location likely following the Richards period of ownership. Historical documentation describes their large six bedroom house (built c. 1918), boathouse, brick garage with servants quarters, caretaker house, and barn all as features of the physical landscape (Country Living 1930). The barn and potentially other central auxiliary structures were remaining on the property from the Richards period of ownership, and lasted well into the 20th century since they are indicated on later maps after the end of the tenant farming period here. The 1912, 1943, and 1958 maps all show that field areas remained fairly consistent between owners. Though by 1958 many of the field areas were being used for growing Loblolly Pine (Figure 6.9) and were no longer open fields. It seems from this data that early on in the tenant period there were few landowner related structures, but as the property changed ownership into the 20th century more auxiliary structures were added, especially under the Fieremontes who did not farm on the property. Some landscape features did not change including the Avenue of Oaks and dirt roads. The central area near the end of the Avenue of Oaks tends to be the area of the most concentrated development on the property over time, though its function and use changes throughout the different periods of ownership.

VII. Interpretations and Conclusions

Integrating data from archaeological excavations, historic maps, and GIS has allowed us to chronicle changing landscape usage through the development of the tenant farming period at Dixie Plantation. Looking at the spatial distribution of these tenant buildings in conjunction with the temporal data we can see the development of the property and how its use transforms over time. The initial cluster of tenant structures on the 1912 map and 1918 survey indicate that there is a grouping of structures located roughly where previous slave settlements had been during the plantation period of the property's
history. There are also some near the main road west of the avenue of oaks (Figure 7.2) The tenant housing expanded out from these previous residences around the slave settlement over time (Figure 7.1). They also trend towards being more centrally located by the barn and stable indicated on the 1912 map and the 1918 survey, and later 1943 and 1958 maps from when John Henry Dick owned the property. We also never see any significant outbuilding structures associated with any tenant houses on any of the maps strengthening the idea of centrally used outbuildings for the whole community. The clustering around central structures seen during the Richards' period, may suggest a model of communal work-animal and tool use historically seen at tenant sites (Ferleger 1993). At the end of the Richards' period, there were two more cabins added to the east of the avenue (one still stands today), and one across Willtown Road was removed. This shift may reflect a desire to live closer to the avenue of oaks, communal barn, and a fresh water source. This also seems to suggest that this was a sharecropper type of arrangement during this time period. As defined by (Brannen 1924) the sharecropper arrangement required the landowner to supply work animals, housing, tools, and half of the fertilizer. The plantation was purchased by the Richards in 1866. Some historical research has noted following the end of the Civil War there was dissention among the enslaved at many Lowcountry plantations. Reactions to the approaching end of the war ranged from violence and looting, to running away, to intentionally slowing down work progress, rebelling against strained and unstable hierarchical structures (Schwalm 1997). With the Richards purchasing the property at the beginning of this dramatic change evokes questions of what might have happened during this transition out of slavery while living on property owned by a new person. Would the change in owners have caused significantly more disorder, or would the new owner have been mostly disregarded? Then after that chaos of the end of the war, how would tenancy have developed under the new landowners? The South Carolina Gazetteer and Business Directory from 1890-1891 lists a Frank Richards as a "farmer" living within two miles of Rantowles, a station on the C & S

Railway that is north of the property, though he maintained the family home in downtown Charleston. If he was not living at Dixie Plantation and continuing plantation style operations, it is unlikely that tenants were working as wage laborers during this time. Since the early wage labor system would have need a supervisor to assign tasks. Likely by this time then, farmers on Dixie Plantation had quickly moved onto a form of the crop lieu system which based on the central structures and barn was likely sharecropping where the landowner supplied tools and work animals in exchange for a portion of the crop.

Just before Williams purchased the property land was deeded to the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co. in 1916 and by 1917 they had constructed a railroad through the north portion of the property with a spur running southwest from the main line across a field on the property. Additions during the Williams' family occupation (1917-1935) were inferred using GIS to compare maps from 1919 and 1943 (Figure **6.6**). During this period, three structures were constructed on the southwest side of the property near the railroad spur. It is likely that the Williams were trying to take advantage of the railroad addition to facilitate the transport of agricultural products. Two additional structures were built on the northeast side of the property near a natural spring and a barn. The later movement of the tenant cabins towards the west end of the property may relate to proximity to the railroad track. This argument, more closely aligns with the argument that Cabak et al (1999) make which is that rural modernization was the largest factor impacting the social organization of people during this time. It is uncertain what type of type of tenancy existed on the property during the Williams ownership. The barn is still present on the property, so a sharecropper system may have continued here. However the addition of structures much further from the barn area seems to make any shared resources less accessible to tenants living on the lower west end of the property near the truck crop spur.

Because Dixie Plantation never transitioned into the intensive, mechanized farming operations, since it was purchased by the Fieremontes in 1935 and converted into a winter residence,

many of the cabin foundations have been left mostly in situ. Further conservation efforts made by John Henry Dick have also resulted in comparatively good preservation of archaeological materials. This site offers an opportunity to investigate a relatively protected tenant occupation site that presumably lasted from around the end of the Civil War until 1935. The numerous shifts in occupation and spatial organization in response to increased industrialization and access to goods also offers an opportunity to further see how modernization and social stratification affected farms that operated using tenant labor during this period. Collection and publication of data collected here will also contribute to beginning to amass larger regional data set which will be most helpful in identifying overall trends and patterns in tenant life ways in the Lowcountry. Small site analysis cannot provide enough data to make large generalizations about this time period. It is necessary to look at larger data sets to identify regional patterns and changes, and to begin to make substantial statements about tenant farming. This time period not only reflects the changing of one major economic and social system, but the onset of the industrialization and commercialization of America. Understanding how these changes impacted a large segment of the American population and how their transition from enslaved life impacted them during this time is an important pursuit. Not only does it help to better understand post-Civil War America and the development economically and socially into our modern system. It also addresses this large segment of the population that has been given little voice in American history.

There is not enough scholarly research done to truly understand the development of tenant farming culture in rich detail. Much work relies heavily on Great Depression era ethnographic information that does not take into account the changing nature of culture. After the end of the Civil War a number of factors would have been influencing the development of this new culture including the economic and social reorganization of the South, the modernization of America, increased mechanized farming, immigration from rural to urban areas, and then the later economic distress brought about by

the boil weevil invasion and the Great Depression. What archaeology that has been done mainly looks at a single site and trying to fit this data with observations in ethnographic research. Future studies in tenant archaeology should work to look at larger collections of regional data to identify patterning between sites. This would be more effective in understanding patterns of landscape usage and allow for more substantiated hypothesis about what this means in relation to the culture rather than looking at particularistic sites. Orser (2010) highlights four major issues that 21st century historical archaeologists are increasingly battling with including: analytical scale, capitalism, vectors of inequality, and heritage and memory. All of these issues are prevalent within the study of tenant farming.

Tenant archaeology will have to contend with these things as well. Analytical scale is evident by looking at the networks of exchange of goods and movement of people throughout the rural south. The constant moving of tenant farmers from farm to farm seeking a better work arrangement (Woofter et al. 1936) is an interesting pattern that cannot be completely understood without taking a multi-site approach. Individual households manifest the social and economic climate; they can illustrate the specific impact of the cultural landscape on the individual. How individual families lived will likely provide interesting information of the culture of tenant farming, but by looking at a larger regional data set patterning in the movement of tenant farmers and material culture as an economic status indicator would provide richer data to investigate trends in the Lowcountry and the Southeast. Thus examination at the small scale incorporated with a larger scale view of tenants will be critical to gain fuller understanding of how tenant farmers adapted to these new economic systems. Likely moving frequently was a way to cope with harsh credit policies and represents an attempt to move up the rigid hierarchical structure of the agricultural ladder.

Additionally, regional patterns in material culture will also provide insight into the development of a modern American industrialized nation and a mentality of mass-consumption. This development of

industry and mass-produced goods may actually account for low levels of variation in artifacts between different ethnic groups and economic levels. As (Stine 1989) discusses in his research, that there may be less difference between quality of goods of the different economic groups and more in quantity of them. A study examining the consumer purchasing patterns of post-bellum tenure classes shows that there may not be major differences in consumption patterns, but in the levels of them (Crass and Brooks 1995). Further investigation of the types and cost of goods found in relation to different tenure classes many help to further understand how the imposition of the crop lieu system and the agricultural ladder affected quality of life. Vectors of inequality have already begun to be addressed by archaeologists studying tenant farmers (Stine 1990, Cabak et al. 1996, Hagood 1977) looking at the agricultural ladder in relationship to economic success and differences between owner and tenants. Status is even more complex since factors such as esteem in the community or respect based on cleanliness of yards and fields (Hagood 1977) also impact social status depending on who is assessing it.

Finally, what archaeologists must contend with in tenant archaeology is heritage and memory. What many archaeologists have recommended, simply because of the value it adds to archaeological study, is the inclusion of informant interviews in tenant archaeology. Though now, in 2015, it is unlikely to find people would really be able to provide primary information about their experience tenant farming in the post-Civil War to mid-20th century period. Where it is possible, however, the inclusion of descendant communities would add great value to any archaeological work and has been done in the past and enhances archaeological findings with personal meaning. What archaeologists will most likely have to confront is the notion of memory: how they represent tenant farmers for future generations and how tenant farmers have already been represented. The generalizations of what tenant farming was like that has been integrated into our cultural memory of this transitional time often through our educational system will be something that needs to be confronted on both a personal and public level. The

archaeologist should be aware of what biases and assumptions they are making in relation to tenant farming culture. Then in presenting information to the public, they may find that they are conflicting with what notions the public may have had about this time period. Oversimplification and generalizations based on ethnicity and economic status will be the greatest challenge. The challenge of the archaeologist is to give voice to the voiceless in history, and through rigorous and empirical archaeological work what I suspect will begin to emerge is a complex and constantly changing landscape with individuals searching for order in the turmoil of economic, cultural, and social change. Taking a close look at the historical issues that individuals during this time period were facing will also prove that these are still things we are facing including social inequality, economic hardships, and contending with developing technologies. It is time now for tenant archaeology to turn away from these patterns of reiterating stale points about the disappearance of tenant sites and the need to do more, and actually take action towards critically examining our assumptions about tenant farming and address this as a valid topic of investigation. CRM research has recorded much information but difficulty of accessing many of these reports makes looking at regional and overall patterning in the material culture challenging. If archaeology wants to address this critical period of cultural change and adaptation to new economic systems, then it will be necessary to move beyond what we already know.

"Simple descriptions of past landscapes can be deceptive. They suggest a fixed character and, more importantly, a fixed experience of the landscape by every observer. Yet this is never the case. A complete account of a historical landscape must therefore take into account its evanescent qualities and the differences in the ways it was experienced. Admittedly, this is much more difficult than to create an inventory of specific features. As with any interesting history we must start with what we know and proceed gingerly to what we think we understand." (Dell Upton 1990, 71)

Moving on past the simple descriptions of tenant sites and constantly restating the same points about tenant farming, requires that archaeologists ask challenging questions. The archaeological record, historical record, and ethnographic sources offer a lot of data for researchers to begin to understand the cultural landscape of this time.

i. APENDIX A: FIGURES



Figure 1.1 Dixie Plantation Location Map



 Imagery Date: 2/8/2013 32°44'17.92" N 80°10'35:81" W elev 26 ft eye alt 3562 ft **Figure 1.2** Designated Archaeological Sites at Dixie Plantation and Areas of Investigation



Figure 1.3 1807 Plat



Figure 1.4 1912 Plat



Figure 1.5 1919 USGS Topographic Map



Figure 1.6 1944A USGS Topographic Map



Figure 1.7 1944B USGS Topographic Map



Figure 1.8 1943 Plat



Figure 1.9 1952 Plat



Figure 2.1 Location Map: Wide Awake Plantation and Adams Run Figure



Figure 2.2 Williams c. 1918 House



Figure 2.3 Fiermonte Renovations to c 1918 House



Figure 5.1 Digitized Houses, Fields, Roads, Railroad on Satellite Imagery



Figure 5.2 Esri Online Map in Conjunction with Esri App



Figure 5.3 All Ruins and Dumps Digitized on Satellite Imagery





Figure 5.5 Locations of Test Units 85 and 87 on Satellite Imagery



Figure 5.6 Portion of 1919 USGS Topographic Map



Figure 6.1 Portion of 1912 Plat



Figure 6.2 Railroad and Truck Spur Digitized on Satellite Imagery



Figure 6.3 Portion of 1943 Plat, Highlighting Housing Near Natural Spring



Figure 6.4 Portion of 1943 Plat, Highlighting Railroad and Truck Crop Spur



Figure 6.5 Richards Period Housing

Legend

- Natural Spring
- Central Structures
- Richards Additions, 1866-1916
- Williams Additions, 1919-1935
- Slave Settlement 1790-1865
 Dirt Road
 - Carrieda
 - 🕂 Railroad, 1916



Figure 6.6 Williams Period Housing

Legend

- 🕴 🛛 Natural Spring
- Central Structures
- Richards Additions, 1866-1916
- Williams Additions, 1919-1935
- Slave Settlement 1790-1865
 - Dirt Road
- Railroad, 1916



Figure 6.7 Location of Structure 2 In Area B on Satellite Imagery



Figure 6.8 Location of Structure 1 on Satellite Imagery





Figure 6.10 Ruin 1 Photograph



Figure 6.11 Ruin 2 Photograph


Figure 6.12 Structure 1, Ruins 1 and 2, and Surface Dump on Satellite Imagery



Figure 6.13 Standing Structure 1 Chimney Photograph



Figure 6.14 Surface Dumps Photograph



Figure 6.15 Structure 1 and Surface Dump Approximate Boundaries on Satellite Imagery



Figure 6.16 Ruin 3 Location on Satellite Imagery



Figure 6.17 Landscape Additions 1912-1918



Figure 6.18 1912 Structures on Satellite Imagery



Figure 6.19 Portion of 1807 Plat



Figure 7.1 Location Comparison: Slave Settlement and Early Tenant Housing



Figure 7.2 Housing near Willtown Road Digitized on Satellite Imagery

ii. APENDIX B: MATERIAL CULTURE DATABASE

	Cat			Depth		Weight					
Site	#	Unit	Level	(in)	Count	(g)	Class	Category	Material	Portion	Type/Description
38CH22				0.15-		\ 0 /			Earthen-		
92	1.01	85	2	1.0		350	Architectural	Brick	ware	Fragment	Red/Orange
38CH22				0.15-					Earthen-		<u> </u>
92	1.02	85	2	1.0	4		Architectural	Brick	ware	Fragment	Red/Orange
38CH22				0.15-						Partial	
92	2.01	85	2	1.0	33		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Shank	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-						Head and	
92	2.02	85	2	1.0	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Partial	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.03	85	2	1.0	2		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Shank	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-						Head and	
92	2.04	85	2	1.0	41		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Partial	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-						Shank and	
92	2.05	85	2	1.0	2		Architectural	Nail	Iron	tip	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-						Head and	
92	2.06	85	2	1.0	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Partial	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.07	85	2	1.0	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Straight	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-						<u> </u>	
92	2.08	85	2	1.0	3		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Straight	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-						<u> </u>	
92	2.09	85	2	1.0	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Bent	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.1	85	2	1.0	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Pulled	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.11	85	2	1.0	2		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Pulled	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.12	85	2	1.0	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Pulled	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.13	85	2	1.0	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Clinched	Machine-cut
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.14	85	2	1.0	1		Furniture	Staple	Iron	Whole	
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.15	85	2	1.0	1		Furniture	Staple	Iron	Whole	
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.16	85	2	1.0	3		Architectural	UID	Iron	Fragment	
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.17	85	2	1.0	2		Architectural	Bracket	Iron	Fragment	L-Shaped
38CH22				0.15-					Earthen-	pipe	
92	2.18	85	2	1.0	1		Smoking	Pipe	ware	bowl/stem	kaolin
38CH22				0.15-					Earthen-	Partial	
92	2.19	85	2	1.0	1		Smoking	Pipe	ware	bowl	kaolin
38CH22				0.15-					Earthen-		
92	2.2	85	2	1.0	3		Smoking	Pipe	ware	Partial stem	kaolin
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.21	85	2	1.0	13		Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Olive-green
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.22	85	2	1.0	23		Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Light Aqua
38CH22				0.15-							
92	2.23	85	2	1.0	8		Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Dark Olive Green

38CH22				0.15-						
92	2.24	85	2	1.0	5	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Amber
38CH22				0.15-					U	
92	2.25	85	2	1.0	18	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Amethyst
38CH22				0.15-					8	j
92	2.26	85	2	1.0	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Amethyst
38CH22				0.15-	-				8	
92	2.27	85	2	1.0	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Cobalt Blue
38CH22		00	_	0.15-	-		Dotte	Chubb	1108	Coourt Diac
92	2.28	85	2	1.0	7	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Clear
38CH22	2.20	05	2	0.15-	,	menen	Dottie	Glubb	Tragmont	Citu
92	2 29	85	2	1.0	9	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Opaque-Clear
38CH22	2.2)	05	2	0.15-	,	Ritelleli	Dottie	Glubb	Tuginoni	Opuque cleur
92	2 30	85	2	1.0	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Clear
38CH22	2.30	05	2	0.15	1	 Kitchen	Dottie	Olass	Base	Cical
02	2 31	85	2	1.0	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Dase	Clear
38CH22	2.31	0.5	2	0.15	1	Kitchen	Dottie	Olass	Raso	Cicai
02	2 22	95	2	1.0	1	Vitahan	Pottla	Class	Dase Dortiol	Clear
92 28CU22	2.32	85	Z	0.15	1	Kitchen	Dottie	Glass	Partial	Clear
38CH22	2 22	95	2	0.13-	1	Vitahan	Pottla	Class	Dase Dortiol	A (110)
92 28CU22	2.33	85	Z	0.15	1	Kitchen	Dottie	Glass	Fattal	Aqua
38CH22	2.24	05	2	0.13-	1	V:tal.au	D = 441 =	Class	Encourse	A
92	2.34	85	2	1.0	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Ametnyst
38CH22	0.25	05	2	0.15-	1	Vital an	D = 441 =	Class	Encourse	A
92	2.35	85	2	1.0	1	 Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Ametnyst
38CH22	0.04	05	•	0.15-		¥77. 1	Dut	C1	Base	A . 1 .
92	2.36	85	2	1.0	l	 Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Partial	Amethyst
38CH22				0.15-				~	Base	~
92	2.37	85	2	1.0	I	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Partial	Clear
38CH22				0.15-				~	Partial	
92	2.38	85	2	1.0	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Spout	Amethyst
							Refined-	American		
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa	Rockingha		
92	2.39	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	m Ware	Body Sherd	Lead-Glazed
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa		Base	
92	2.40	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	Ironstone	Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.41	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Body Sherd	Blue-Pink Motif
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.42	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	Ironstone	Rim Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa		Base	
92	2.43	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	Ironstone	Sherd	
38CH22				0.15-		Historic				
92	2.44	85	2	1.0	2	Ceramic		Stone-ware	Sherds	Dark Glaze
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa	Anular-	Body	
92	2.45	85	2	1.0	2	Ceramic	re	ware	Sherds	Banded
	-						Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa		Body	
92	2.46	85	2	1.0	2	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Sherds	Blue Motif
38CH22			-	0.15-		 Historic	Refined-			Shell-Edged
92	2 47	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	Earthenwa	Pearlware	Rim Sherd	Blue
	/	00	-	1.0	-	Corumit	Landionwa	- currinure		

							re			
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.48	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Body Sherd	Blue Motif
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.49	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	Ironstone	Base Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.50	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Rim Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa	Anular-		
92	2.51	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	ware	Body Sherd	Cabled
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa	Cream-		
92	2.52	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	ware	Body Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.53	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Rim Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.54	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Base Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.55	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	Pearlware	Rim Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa		Body	
92	2.56	85	2	1.0	5	Ceramic	re	Ironstone	Sherds	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa			
92	2.57	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	Pearlware	Body Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa		Body	
92	2.58	85	2	1.0	15	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Sherds	
							Refined-			
38CH22				0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa		Handle	
92	2.59	85	2	1.0	1	Ceramic	re	Pearlware	Sherd	
							Refined-			
38CH22			_	0.15-		Historic	Earthenwa		Body	
92	2.60	85	2	1.0	4	Ceramic	re	Pearlware	Sherds	
38CH22			-	0.15-	_		~	Oyster		
92	2.61	85	2	1.0	2	Faunal	Shell	Shell		
38CH22			-	0.15-						
92	2.62	85	2	1.0	1	Metallic				
38CH22			-	0.15-			~		Percussion	-
93	2.63	85	2	1.0	1	Other	Gun		Сар	Bronze
38CH22	0.53	0.5	2	0.15-	~	F 1	Unidentifi			
94	2.64	85	2	1.0	9	Faunal	ed	D 1	D it	
38CH22	0.55	0.5	~	0.15-		G 1.	D.	Earthen-	Partial-	
95	2.65	85	2	1.0	1	Smoking	Pipe	ware	Bowl	
38CH22	2.55	07	2	0.15-	11	A 1. 1	D.1		E	
96	2.66	85	2	1.0	11	Architectural	Brick		Fragment	
38CH22	2.01	07	2	0.15-		3.6 - 11				
97	3.01	87	2	0.85	1	Metallic				

38CH22				0.15-						
98	3.02	87	2	0.85	9	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragments	Clear
38CH22				0.15-						
99	3.03	87	2	0.85	5	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragments	Agua
38CH23				0.15-	-					_
00	3.04	87	2	0.85	1	Metallic				
38CH23	0.0.	07	-	0.15-	-	1.10000110			Flat Glass	
01	3 05	87	2	0.85	34	Architectural	Window	Glass	Fragments	Aqua
38CH23	5.05	07	2	0.05	51	Themteeturur	() Indo ()	Giubb	Tragmonts	- Iquu
02	3.06	87	2	0.85	28	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragments	Clear
38CH23	5.00	07	2	0.05	20	ititellell	Dottie	Giuss	Tuginents	Cieur
03	3.07	87	2	0.15	1	Other	Pebble		Fragment	Grev
00	5.07	07		0.00	1	oulor	Refined-		Tragmont	Grey
38CH23				0.15-		Historic	Farthenwa			
04	3.08	87	2	0.15	1	Ceramic	re	White-ware	Body Sherd	
38CH23	5.00	07	2	0.05	1	Cerunne	Brick and	Farthen-	Body Sherd	Red/Orange Brick
05	3.09	87	2	0.15	30	Architectural	Mortar	ware	Fragment	Fragments
38CH23	5.07	07	2	0.05	50	Memteeturur	Worta	ware	Tuginent	Tragments
06	31	87	2	0.15-	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Amethyst
38CH23	5.1	07	2	0.05	1	Kitchen	Dottie	01035	Taginent	Amethyst
07	3 1 1	87	2	0.15-	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Oliva graan
38CH23	5.11	07	2	0.05	1	Kitchell	Dottie	Glass	Taginent	Olive-green
38CH23	3 1 2	87	2	0.15-	6	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Opaque Clear
380423	5.12	07	2	0.05	0	Kitchen	Dottie	Glass	Taginent	Opaque-Cicai
00	3 1 3	87	2	0.15-	2	Architactural	Window	Glass	Fragmonts	Close
280422	5.15	07	2	0.05	2	Alchitectura	w maow	Glass	Fragments	Citai
36СП25 10	2 1 4	07	2	0.15-	1	Other	Clothing	Dutton		Diastia
2901122	5.14	07	Z	0.65	1	Other	Clouning	Duitoll		Flastic
36CП25	2 1 5	07	2	0.15-	2	Vitahan	Food	Dried		
2901122	5.15	07	Z	0.65	2	Kitchen	FOOD	Dealls		
30CH25	2 16	07	2	0.15-	1	Vitahan	Pottla	Class	Erogmont	Amothyst
12	5.10	87	Z	0.85	1	Kitchen	Боше	Glass	Pragment Dertial	Ametnyst
2001122				0.15					Paruai	
36CП25 12	2 17	07	2	0.15-	1	Vitahan	Pottla	Class	Dase Erogmont	Clear
15	5.17	07	L	0.65	1	Kitchen	Doule	Glass	Flagment	Cleal
36CП25	2 1 0	07	2	0.15-	1	Commin			Encoment	
14	5.18	87	Z	0.85	1	Ceramic	Drahistari		Fragment	
36CП25	2 10	07	2	0.15-	o	Commin			Encomente	
13	5.19	87	Z	0.85	0	Ceramic	c Ceramic		Fragments	
38CH23	2 20	07	2	0.15-	5	Formal			Encomente	
2901122	5.20	07	Z	0.65	5	Faultal	Dailmood		Flagments	
38CH23	2 01	07	2	0.15-	1	Mada11: a	Kallroad	Turn	Commlete	
1/	3.21	8/	2	0.85	1	Metallic	бріке	Iron	Complete	
2001122				0.15					Partial	
38CH23	2.22	07	2	0.15-	1	Wit also an	D = #1=	Class	Base England	Amelian
18	3.22	8/	2	0.85	1	Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Amber
38CH23	2.22	07	2	0.15-	1	F 1	C1 11	0		
19	3.23	8/	2	0.85	1	Faunal	Shell	Oyster		
38CH23	2.24	07	2	0.15-		A 1	Dia			DI
20	3.24	8/	2	0.85	1	Architectural	Paint Chip			вше
38CH23	2.25	07	2	0.15-		A 1	Dried			DI
21	3.25	87	2	0.85	1	Architectural	Paint			Blue
38CH23	2.25	07	~	0.15-	10		Rooting			D1 (C
22	3.26	87	2	0.85	13	Architectural	Shingle	Asphalt	Fragments	Blue/Green
38CH23		25	-	0.15-						
23	3.27	87	2	0.85	1	Firearms	Bullet			22-Caliber

38CH23				0.15-						Partial-	
24	3.28	87	2	0.85	10		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Shaft	Machine-cut
										Head and	
38CH23				0.15-						Partial-	
25	3.29	87	2	0.85	6		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Shaft	Machine-cut
38CH23				0.15-	-				-		
26	3.3	87	2	0.85	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Straight	Wire Pulled
38CH23				0.15-	-					~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
27	3.31	87	2	0.85	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Straight	Machine-cut
38CH23	5.51	07	-	0.05	1		Themteetului	1 (ull	non	Straight	
28	3.32	87	2	0.85	1		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Pulled	Machine-cut
38CH23	0.02	0,	_	0.15-	-		1			1 01100	
29	3 33	87	2	0.85	1		Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragment	Amber
38CH23	5.55	07	-	0.05	1		Thronon	Dottie	Ciuss	Tragilioni	
30	3 34	87	2	0.85	2		Metallic	UID			
38CH23	5.51	07	-	0.05	2		Metallie	CID			
31	3 35	87	2	0.15	7		Organic	Charcoal		Fragments	
38CH23	5.55	07	2	0.05	,		orgunie	Chareour		Tragments	
32	3 36	87	2	0.15	1		Kitchen	Can	Aluminum	Pull Tab	
52	5.50	07	2	0.05	1		Ititellell	Cull	7 Hummuni	Head and	
38CH23				0.85-						Partial-	
33	4 01	87	3	11	2		Architectural	Nail	Iron	Shaft	Machine-cut
38CH23	1.01	07		0.85-	2		Theinteetului	Ttull	non	LIID	Widemine eut
34	4 02	87	3	11	1		Kitchen		Glass	Fragment	Melted
380423	4.02	07		0.85-	1		Ritellell		01035	Tagment	Wiened
35	4 03	87	3	1 1	3		Kitchen	Bottle	Glass	Fragments	Aqua
38CH23	4.05	07	5	0.85	5		Kitellell	Dottie	01435	Taginents	Ациа
36	4.04	87	3	1.1	1		Faunal	Boar		Tusk	
38CH23	7.07	07	5	0.85	1		1 aunai	Doar		Complete	
37	4.05	87	3	1.1	1		Kitchen	Vessel	Glass	Handle	Clear
380423	4.05	07	5	0.85	1		Kitcheli	VCSSCI	Olass	Talluic	Cical
38	4.06	87	3	1.1	25		Faunal				
380423	4.00	07	5	0.85	23		Taullai	Drobistori			
30	4.07	87	3	1.1	1		Lithic	c Lithic			
3900033	4.07	07	5	0.85	1		Littile	C Liune			
38CH23	1.08	87	3	1.1	5		Found			Fragmonts	Burnad
40	4.08	07	5	1.1	5		Taullai	Defined		Tragments	Duffieu
2801122				0.95			Uistoria	Keillieu-			
38CH25 41	1.00	87	3	1.1	1		Ceramic	re	White ware	Rim Shord	
-+1 28CU22	4.09	07	5	0.85	1		Uistoria	10	winte-wale	Killi Sheiu	Dark Brown
лосп2э 12	4.10	07	2	0.63-	1		Coromio		Stone wore	Dody Shard	Speekled Clare
42 29CU22	4.10	0/	3	1.1	1		Ceramic		Stone-ware	Bouy Sherd	Ded/Oren as Drivia
38CH23	4 1 1	07	2	0.85-		24	A	Dai ala	Eartnen-	Encoursents	Red/Orange Brick
43	4.11	8/	5	1.1		54	Architectural	Brick	ware	Fragments	Fragments

iii. APPENDIX C: GRAPHS



Count

88



Count



Count



Count



Count



Count



Count

WORKS CITED

Adams, W. H.

1980 Waverly Plantation: Ethnoarchaeology of a Tenant Farming Community.

Resource Analysts Inc. Bloomington, IN.

Agee, James, and Walker Evans

1941 Let Us Now Praise Famous Men: Three Tenant Families. Houghton Mifflin,Boston.

Anderson, David G., Judith A. Newkirk, and E. Suzanne Carter

1979 Archaeological Survey and cultural resources overviews: Santee National
Wildlife Refuge, Clarendon County, South Carolina. *Final Contract Report A-5810(78)*,
Interagency Archaeological Services, Atlanta. NTIS, Washington, D.C.

Anderson, David G. and Janalee Muse

1981 An archaeological reconnaissance of the Calrendon County Industrial Park. *Common Wealth Associates Inc.* Report No. 2398. Jackson, Michigan.

Anderson, David G. and Jenalee Muse

1982 The Archaeology of Tenancy: An Example From The South Carolina Low Country. *South Carolina Antiquities*. 14(1-2), 71-85

Anderson, D. G., Muse, J., & Trinkley, M.

1983 The Archaeology of Tenancy (2): A Reply to Trinkley [With Reply]. *Southeastern Archaeology*, 65-69.

Anderson, David G., Jenalee Muse, and Michael Trinkley

1983 The Archaeology of Tenancy (2): A Reply to Trinkley [With Reply] *Southeastern Archaeology*. 2(1), 65-69.

Anonymous

1890-1891 *South Carolina Gazetteer and Business Directory.* Charleston, SC.

Anonymous

1917 Dixie Plantation Property Title.

Anonymous

1934-1950 *Records Relating to Dixie Plantation*. S.C. Historical Society Manuscript.College of Charleston Special Collections, Addlestone Library. 43/2303.

Anonymous

1937(?) Dixie Plantation, Unidentified newspaper and date. College of CharlestonSpecial Collections, Addlestone Library.

Anonymous

Unknown Date. Fiermonte Puts \$30,000 on Home. Unidentified Newspaper and Date. College of Charleston Special Collections. Addlestone Library.

Anschuetz, Kurt F., Richard H. Wilshusen, and Cherie L. Scheick

2001 An Archaeology of Landscapes: Perspectives and Directions. *Journal of Archaeological Research*. 9 (2): 157-211.

Buist, B.R.

1917 Abstract of Title, Filed with Charleston County on May 3, 1917. College of Charleston Special Collections, Addlestone Library.

Boeger, E.A. and E.A. Goldenweiser

1916 *A Study of Tenant Systems of Farming in the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta*. United States Department of Agriculture Bulletin No. 337. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Brannen, C. O.

1924 Relatn of Land Tenure to Plantation Organization. United States Department of Agriculture, Bulletin No. 1269. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
 Bruseth, James and Randall Moir (Editors)

1987 *Richland Creek Technical Series*, Vols 1, 4, 6. Archaeological Research Program, Institute for the Study of Earth and Man, Southern Methodist University, Dallas.

Brown, K. L., & Cooper, D. C.

1990 Structural continuity in an African-American slave and tenant community.

Historical Archaeology, 24(4), 7-19.

Brown, K. L.

2004 Ethnographic Analogy, Archaeology, and the African Diaspora: Perspectives from a Tenant Community. *Historical Archaeology*, 38(1), 79.

Cabak, Melanie A., and Mary M. Inkrot

1996 Material Characteristics of Operator and Tenant Farmsteads in the Aiken Plateau,1875-1950. *South Carolina Antiquities*. 28 (1 and 2): 45-70.

Cabak, M. A., Groover, M. D., & Inkrot, M. M.

1999 Rural modernization during the recent past: Farmstead archaeology in the Aiken Plateau. *Historical Archaeology*, 19-43.

U.S. Census Bureau

1880 South Carolina Census

Cobb, C. A.

1936 The South's Farm Tenancy Problem. U.S. Department of Agriculture,

Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Southern Region, Miscellaneous Series 1.

Cosgrove, Denis E.

1984 *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. Barnes and Noble, Totowa, New Jersey.

Country Living

1930 Advertisement. Country Living: 8.

Falls, Eva

2014 An Archaeological Exploration of a Settlement At Dixie Plantation, Hollywood,

SC. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Eastern Carolina University, Greenville, NC.

Fallers, Lloyd

1973 Inequality. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Ferleger, Louis

1993 "Sharecropping Labor Contracts in the Nineteenth Century South". *Agricultural*

History 67(3): 31-46.

Deetz, James

1977 In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life. Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, New York. Dick, John Henry

1919-1995 *The John Henry Dick Journals, 1947-1987.* S.C. Historical Society Manuscript. 34/0655.

Drucker, Lesley M and Rebecca G. Fulmer

1981 Cultural resources in investigations for Union Camp's proposed EAstovers mill tract, Richland County, South Carolina. *Carolina Archaeological Services Resource Studies Series 44*. Columbia, South Carolina.

Gould, Richard A.

1971 The Archaeologist as Ethnographer: A Case from the Western Desert of Australia. *World Archaeology* 3: 101-122.

Gordon, Milton

1963 Social Class in American Sociology. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Groover, M. D.

2004 Household Succession as a Catalyst of Landscape Change:

240. *Historical Archaeology*, 38(4): 25-43.

Groover, M. D.

2008 The Archaeology of North American Farmsteads. University

Press of Florida.

Hagood, Margaret Jarman

1977 *Mothers of the South:Portraiture of the White Tenant Farm Woman.* Reprint of 1939 edition. W.W. Norton, New York.

Henry, Susan L.

1995 The National Register and the 20th Century: Is There Room For Archaeology? *CRM*, 18 (6): 9-12.

Hirsch, E., and O'Hanlon, M. (eds.)

1995 *The Archaeology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space.* Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Holland, Claudia C.

1990 Tenant Farms of the Past, Present, and Future: An

Ethnoarchaeological View. *Historical Archaeology*, 24(4), 60-69.

Kniffen, Fred and Henry Glassie

1966 Building in Wood in the Eastern United States: A Time-Place Perspective.

American Geographical Society. 56 (1), 40-66.

Knoth, Robert F. (surveryor)

1943 *A map of Dixie Plantation*. S.C. Historical Society Manuscript. College of Charleston Special Collections, Addlestone Library. 32-131.

Leone, Mark and Parker Potter (Editors)

1988 *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States.* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

McAlester, Virginia, and Lee McAlester

1984 A Field Guide to American Houses. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Masterman, M

1970 The nature of a paradigm. In Lakatos, I., and Musgrave, A. (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 59-89.

Moir, Randall W.

1982 Sheet Refuse: An Indicator of Past Lifeways. In *Settlement of the Prairie Margin: Archaeology of the Richland Creek Reservoir, Navarro and Freestone Counties, Texas, 1980-1981: A Research Synopsis,* edited by L. Mark Raab, pp 139-152. Archaeology Research Program, Southern Methodist University, Dallas.

News and Courier

1938 Mrs. Madeline T. Dick, Robbed of Jewelry on Train, Finds Home in Ruins. *The News and Courier*. December 1938, 1. Charleston, SC.

Orser, Charles E., Jr. and Claudia Holland

1984 Let Us Praise Famous Men, Accurately: Toward a More Complete Understanding of Postbellum Southern Agricultural Practices. *Southeastern Archaeology* 3:111-120.

Orser, Charles E., Jr.

Artifacts, Documents and Memories of the Black Tenant Farmer. Archaeology, 6,48-53.

Orser, Charles E., Jr. and Annette M. Nekola

1985 Plantation Settlement from Slavery to Tenancy: An example from a Piedmont Plantation in South Carolina. In *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*, edited by Theresa A. Singleton, pp. 67-98. Academic Press, Orlando.

Orser, Charles E., Jr.

1999 Archaeology and the Challenges of Capitalist Farm Tenancy inAmerica. In Historical Archaeologies of Capitalism,143-167. Springer US.

Orser, Charles E., Jr.

1988 The Material Basis of the Post-Bellum Tenant Plantation: Historical Archaeology in the South Carolina Piedmont. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Orser, Charles E., Jr.

2010 Twenty-first-century historical archaeology. Journal of

Archaeological Research. 18(2): 111-150.

Padgett, Thomas J.

1983 Relevance and responsiveness in small scale surveys for transportation and public works projects. *American Archaeology*. 4(1):14-16.

Pluckhahn, T. J.

2010 Household Archaeology in the Southeastern United States:

History, Trends, and Challenges. Journal of Archaeological Research, 18(4), 331-385.

Preucel, R. W.

1998 Cultural landscapes and southwestern archaeology: Theory and practice. Paper presented at the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Seattle.

Prunty Jr., Merle

1955 The Renaissance of the Southern Plantation. *Geographical Review*, 45 (4), 459-491.

Pyszka, Kimberly

2014 "...built for the publick worship of God, according to the Church of England":Anglican Landscapes and Colonialism in South Carolina. Historical Archaeology 47:1-22.

Pyszka, Kimberly

2012a The St. Paul's Parsonage House and the Social Functions of South Carolina

Anglican Parsonages. South Carolina Antiquities Vol. 44:75-84.

2012b "unto Seynte Paules: Anglican Landscapes and Colonialism in South Carolina."

Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

Pyszka, K., N. Fulmer, M. Hays, and K. McNabb

2011 "...a small but convenient House of Brick": A Tale of the St. Paul's ParsonageHouse, Hollywood, South Carolina, USA. Journal of the Society for Church Archaeology15:47-54.

Pyszka, K., M. Hays, and S. Harris

2010 The Archaeology of St. Paul's Parish Church, Hollywood, South Carolina, USA. Journal of the Society for Church Archaeology 12:73-80.

Ransom, Roger and Richard Sutch

1969 *The Rise of Sharecropping in the American South: 1865-1900.* University of California, Institute of Business and Economic Research, Southern Economic History Project, Working Paper 1.

Ransom, Roger L. and Richard Sutch

1977 *One kind of freedom: The economic consequences of emancipation.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne.

Reid, Joseph D.

1973 Sharecropping as an Understandable Market Response: the Post-bellum South. *Journal of Economic History* 23: 106-131. Riordan, Timothy

1985 The Relative Economic Status of Black and White Regiments in the Pre-World

War I Army: An Example from fort Walla Walla, Washington. Ph. D. dissertation,

Department of Anthropology, Washington State University, Pullman.

Schwalm, Leslie A.

1997 "Sweet Dreams of Freedom": Freedwomen's Reconstruction of Life and Labor in Lowcountry South Carolina. *Journal of Women's History*. 9(1): 9-38

Stiles, Daniel

1977 Ethnoarchaeology: A Discussion of Methods and Applications. Man. 12:87-103.

Stine, Roy S.

1989 Statistical Analysis of Rural Sites. Paper presented at the 62nd annual meeting of the South Carolina Academy of Sciences, Columbia, South Carolina.

Tumin, Melvin

1970 Social Stratification: The Forms and Functions of Inequality. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Trinkley, M.

1983 Let Us Now Praise Famous Men- If Only We Can Find Them. *Southeastern Archaeology*. 3(2): 30-36.

Trinkley, Michael and Caballero

1983a An Archaeological and Historical Evaluation of the i-85 Northern Alternative, Spartenburg County, South Carolina. South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia. Trinkley, Michael and Caballero

1983b Additional Archaeological, Historical, and Architectural Evaluation of 38Hr 127 and 38Hr 131, Horry County, South Carolina. South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia.

U.S. Geological Survey

1919 Wadmelaw Island Quadrangle, South Carolina (Map). Surveyed 1918.1:62,500. 1
5 Minute Series. U.S. War Department, USGS 1919.

U.S. Geological Survey

1944a Wadmelaw Island Quadrangle, South Carolina (Map). Photorevised 1941.

1:62,500. 15 Minute Series. U.S. War Department, USGS.

1944b Wadmelaw Island Quadrangle, South Carolina (Map). 1:62,500. 15 Minute

Series. U.S. War Department, USGS.

United States Department of Agriculture

1939 *The Farm-housing Survey*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication 323.

Upton, Dell

1990 Imagining the Early Virginia Landscape. In *Earth Patterns: Essays in Landscape Archaeology*. Pp. 71-86. William M Kelso and Rachel Most (eds.). University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

White, John R.

1977 Ethnoarchaeology, Ethnohistory, Ethnographic Analogy, and the Direct-Historical Approach: Four Methodological Entities Commonoly Misconstrued. *Conference on Historic Sites Archaeology Papers* 1976, 11:98-110. Woofter, T.J., Jr., Gordon Blackwell, Harold Hoffsommer, James G. Maddox, Jean M.

Massell, B.O. Williams, and Walker Wynne, Jr.

1936 *Landlord and Tenant on the Cotton Plantation*.Monograph 5. United States Works Progress Administration, Division of Social Research. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Wilson, John S.

1990 We've Got Thousands of These! What Makes a Historic Farmstead Significant? *Historical Archaeology*, 24(2): 23-33.

Maps throughout this paper were created using ArcGIS® software by Esri. ArcGIS® and ArcMap[™] are the intellectual property of Esri and are used herein under license. Copyright © Esri. All rights reserved. For more information about Esri® software, please visit www.esri.com