CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Between April 12, 1861, and April 9, 1865, Americans fought Americans in a civil war costing the lives of some 618,200 soldiers, and devastating the property and economy of the southeastern portion of the United States. One of the longest campaigns of this war was the siege of Charleston, South Carolina. From June 1863 to February 1865, Union forces attempted to reduce the fortifications protecting Charleston Harbor so that a fleet could enter and capture the town. During the long siege, Folly Island, a small barrier island approximately six miles southeast of Charleston (Figure 1.1), was used by the North as a staging ground and encampment. Today, most of the physical remains of this occupation have been eroded by erosion, development, and relic collectors. However, in May of 1987, and in the summer and fall of 1988, the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA or the Institute) was given a rare opportunity to archaeologically investigate a portion of a Union camp, and a cemetery of black Union troops, before the area was developed. This report presents the preliminary results of that investigation.

The next section of Chapter I relates the Institute's work history at Folly Island. Following a brief examination of the local environmental conditions, the research design and methodology are presented. These latter two sections were prepared to organize and focus project goals, and to outline the manner in which the goals would be reached. In military terms, they are the strategy and tactics of the project, as President Lincoln’s strategy for winning the war included the capture of Charleston. More specific and specialized methods are presented, as necessary, within each later section of the report. In war, generals and captains must constantly revise and even change their methodology once the battle is joined, adjusting to the problems and opportunities observed through the 'fog of war.' In archaeology, field directors and excavators must also adjust their methods as the site is revealed through the 'fog of excavation.'

Chapter II presents an overview of the history of Union occupation on Folly Island as it relates to the archaeological efforts. Here, no attempt has been made to provide a definitive work on the war around Charleston. A thorough history is provided, but its purpose is to provide context and to present details which will aid an understanding of the archaeological findings. Especially pertinent is information about the lives of soldiers in the 55th Massachusetts and the 1st North Carolina Colored Infan-
try, since these two regiments are probably represented by the skeletal remains recovered at the cemetery site 38CH920. The reams of historical documents that are available for future research, are staggering. Like the archaeology, the Institute has only scratched the surface of what could be learned through further archival research.

Chapter III presents the results of the archaeological excavations at 38CH920. Chapter IV discusses the excavations at 38CH964, 38CH965, and 38CH966 (Figure 1.2). This separation of the archaeological sites into two chapters is made both for convenience, and because the deposits from 38CH920 are different from the other three sites. Site 38CH920, as noted, was a black military cemetery. The other sites represent camp refuse and activity areas of several unidentified Union military units, both black and white. Information about methods particular to each site is detailed in these two chapters. The features found at each site and where possible, their function, are also described. Artifacts are discussed in these chapters as they relate to, and help to interpret the features discovered. For the professional archaeologist, raw counts of artifacts are presented in Appendix F.

Chapter V looks at the artifacts in a different way. Here, they are discussed as functional groups and analyzed to see what they reveal about the soldiers' lives on Folly Island. This section should be of special interest to archaeologists who might excavate similar sites.

Chapter VI presents preliminary conclusions and attempts to incorporate all findings into a synthetic statement. Undoubtedly, further documentary and archaeological research will change the conclusions presented here, and for that reason alone, they must be seen as preliminary. Given the limited scope, funding, and timeframe for this project, as well as the staggering reality of the unresearched documents and unexcavated portions of the site, this report must be seen as simply an attempt to assess the archaeological study of Folly Island to date. The conclusions review what is known and what is not known, and offer recommendations for future research. It should be noted that in preparing this report, every attempt has been made to reach both the professional archaeologist and the interested layman. It is hoped that the format and style are both readable for the public, and complete in technical detail for the professional.

As a final note, it must be stated that SCIAA is quite aware of the overwhelming body of Civil War literature available today. Because so much information exists,
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The history of archaeological investigations at Folly Island is as complex as the history of the Civil War itself. When salvage excavations initially began at the cemetery site, 38CH920, no one had any idea that the project would continue for two years and would involve three field seasons for the Institute, as well as a compliance level survey by other archaeologists. In hindsight, had this been a pure research project from the beginning, the research, methods, and results would have been very different. Still, comfort is taken in the knowledge that if the problem had been ignored after that first visit, the site and all of its secrets would have been forever lost.

On May 11, 1987, SCIAB was informed by relic collectors that human bones were being unearthed at a construction site on Folly Island. The area, which is known as the Seabrook Tract after its former owner, was being developed as a private residential community by Ravenel, Eisenhardt Securities, Inc., through First Coastal Properties, Inc. The area was previously known by local and out-of-state collectors as a excellent place to find Civil War relics. During the war, the entire island was the staging ground for Union troops as they besieged Charleston. Much of the modern town of Folly Beach covers these grounds, but the Seabrook property had remained undeveloped until 1987. Collecting had occurred at a steady pace for at least twenty years, drawing metal detector enthusiasts from the surrounding states. However, the construction of roadbeds had turned parts of the project area from a forest with moderate to heavy understory into open, exposed sand dunes. When word of the construction activities spread, the collectors began flocking to the area. Two avid collectors, Mr. Robert Bohm and Mr. Eric Croen, discovered the bones, and eventually called the Institute.

Principal Investigator, Steven D. Smith, met the collectors at the site on May 14, 1987. They were concerned that other collectors might loot the cemetery, and wanted the Institute to recover the burials and rebury the remains in a National Cemetery. At that point, it was clear that the cemetery was threatened by further construction of the roadbed (today, the sand ridge has been totally leveled) and probable discovery by other collectors. To prevent further disturbance of the cemetery, protective, legal steps needed to be implemented immediately. A key question was whether the site could be considered to have archaeological potential, or whether the burials should be turned over to the Charleston County Coroner for handling as an abandoned cemetery. South Carolina has no specific archaeological burial law, and the only laws pertaining to this problem at that time were SC Code of Laws 27-43-10 through 40 and 16-17-600. These laws define an abandoned cemetery, and state that the persons wishing to move an abandoned cemetery must work with the local governing body to locate next of kin prior to re-interment. There is no law providing for scientific examination.

The landowner and the County Coroner were contacted, along with the Charleston County Medical Examiner’s Office and officials of the City of Folly Beach. After much discussion with all of these interested parties, everyone was in agreement that the burials were not of recent origin and had considerable historical interest. All parties were concerned that the skeletal material eventually be reburied, but they also were interested in the archaeological potential of the site. Despite subsequent problems with many parties over the next two years, the Institute then received and continued to receive, cordial, professional assistance from the developer, the City of Folly Beach, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The project also received excellent press and strong public interest.

SCIAB proceeded with plans for sampling the burials and contacted the SHPO on May 15, to see if any State Coastal Council compliance or Federal compliance was involved with the project. At that point, there was none, and there was no legal obligation on the part of the developer to stop construction. On May 18, the Principal Investigator and the developer met on site and agreed to a 30-day construction delay in the area, while the Institute conducted salvage archaeological excavations. Assistance was provided by the developer and the City of Folly Beach, who together arranged security for the site. During the excavations, the collectors who discovered the site, the Charleston County Medical Examiner’s Office, and The Charleston Museum provided extra labor and equipment.

Fieldwork at 38CH920, the cemetery site, began on May 19, 1987 with two management goals in mind: 1) to
Figure 1.1: Detail of Folly Island, U.S.G.S. 7.5 James Island topographic map, 1959 (photorevised 1979). (Arrow locates project area.)
collect an archaeological sample of the burials, and 2) to take the sample from the roadbed where they would otherwise be destroyed or looted. Balanced against these goals were the unknown number of burials and only a limited ability to sustain fieldwork due to lack of funding. An arrangement was made for the Institute to help monitor further road construction to facilitate the recovery of any burials not found during the excavations. Burials not discovered during archaeological excavation or construction were best left in place at this point. It was hoped that local environmental conditions and the new residents would help to protect any burials left behind.

The fieldwork was completed after two weeks (May 19, 1987 to May 29, 1987) and during that time the Institute recovered 14 burials, the skeletal remains being only partially complete. This fieldwork was field directed by Sharon L. Pekrul. The archaeological materials were taken to the Institute in Columbia, South Carolina, where washing, cataloging, and preliminary analysis began. Meanwhile, Dr. Ted Rathbun, Deputy State Archaeologist for Forensics began analysis on the skeletal material. Progress with both the archaeological analysis and the physical anthropological analysis was slow, as it was conducted during spare time with limited funding.

At this point in time it was assumed that, except for limited monitoring, SCIAA’s efforts at Folly Island would be confined to producing a report on 38CH920, and reburial of the skeletal materials afterwards. In June 1987, the developer received word from the South Carolina Coastal Council that because of the cemetery discovery, there might be other sites in the project area. In compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act, certification of their Department of Health and Environmental Control water supply permit must take into account any further sites eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. A survey of the 42-acre project area was recommended by the SHPO. Carolina Archaeological Services, Inc. (CAS) began monitoring further construction on the property and performed the required survey beginning on July 30, 1987. They discovered nine additional sites and two isolated finds (Drucker and Jackson 1988:4). Three of the sites, 38CH964, 38CH965, 38CH966, were recommended as eligible for the National Register. Carolina Archaeological Services, Inc. continued to monitor these sites through the fall of 1987.

During this period, the Institute produced a management summary for Ravenel, Eiserhardt Securities, Inc. submitted on August 10, 1987. In the summary, SCIAA recommended that the cemetery site was eligible for the National Register. In that same month, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was signed by the developer and the SHPO. The MOA stipulated that the sites recommended as eligible by CAS would be preserved in place, or if they could not be avoided, data recovery would be conducted. The Institute was named in the MOA as responsible for producing a report on 38CH920, prior to the final certification of the developer’s permits. Finally, if more burials were discovered in subsequent landscaping activities, these activities would cease, and the SHPO and the Institute would be notified. The Institute agreed to oversee the recovery of any further burials.

In late December 1987, the Institute was again contacted by Robert Bohm and told of additional human burials being exposed by sewer line construction near 38CH920. This was reported to the SHPO, and because CAS was currently under retainer by the developer, they conducted excavations of these burials (numbered 15 through 18) and monitored the rest of the pipeline construction (Anthony and Drucker 1988). The burial materials were transmitted to Dr. Rathbun upon completion of CAS’s report. Because of these late discoveries, the developer and the SHPO reached another agreement for all house lots in the immediate area of 38CH920. This agreement included a clause in the deeds of sale for the lots, which stated that SCIAA must be contacted if further human burials were ever discovered.

In April 1988, CAS submitted its final survey report and it was clear that data recovery (excavation) would be necessary at the three sites 38CH964, 38CH965, and 38CH966. The sites could not be avoided with the construction of housing. The Institute had been negotiating a contract with the developer to complete its studies and finish the report of investigations at 38CH920. Since further excavations were now necessary, SCIAA entered into a contract with the developer to complete both projects.

It was clear that a major Civil War occupation existed in the area, confirmed by both collectors and by continuing archival research. However, all previous efforts led the Institute to believe that though the project area contained artifacts, it was heavily disturbed. The project area, for instance, had been logged three times by the past landowner, and also had been thoroughly churned for artifacts. There were many potholes within the wooded project area. The survey report by CAS appeared to corroborate this assumption as only three partially potted sites were recommended as eligible for the National Register. Therefore, the Institute submitted a proposal for a small data recovery project of three weeks fieldwork. The SHPO reviewed the proposal and was very cooperative in speedup the paperwork so that excavations could begin.

These archaeological investigations (June 28, 1988 to July 22, 1988) were directed by Lisa D. O’Steen. The first two weeks of fieldwork confirmed the Institute’s suspicions about the condition of the sites. Sites 38CH966 and 38CH965 both appeared to be heavily disturbed (see Chapter IV). Features were discovered, but they were disturbed and mixed with the refuse of modern relic
collectors. Further, the Institute's research goal, which was to obtain a sample of material culture from a Civil War camp, was being met. However, during the third and final field week, archaeologists began to discover deeply buried, intact deposits at 38CH964 dating to the Union occupation. Also, collectors independently verified the Field Director's suspicions that the depressions seen throughout the project area often contained deep, intact features. Collectors called these depressions "tent sites." (In the final analysis, these depressions represented both potholes and Civil War features.) However, the true character of the project area, which in hindsight should have been obvious, was finally being discovered. With this data, combined with the potential of 42 acres of uninvestigated buried deposits confronting the archaeologists, the Institute decided it had to entirely re-think its approach to the project.

The Institute completed an additional, unscheduled week of fieldwork, concentrating on resurvey of the project area, in an attempt to assess what lay beyond the site limits originally defined by CAS. Some 150 surface depressions were recognized and flagged throughout the project area.

The archaeologists were now faced with a situation in which the scheduled compliance fieldwork was complete, but further investigation was definitely necessary. The South Carolina Coastal Council regulations, which necessitated the survey by CAS and the data recovery project by SCIAA, do not have provisions for late discoveries. From a research point of view, there was a real need to collect a sample of material culture from different military units, including samples from both white and black units. This, combined with the cemetery excavations, offered a unique and important research opportunity. Once again, the developer and the SHPO reached a revised agreement. This agreement allowed time for the Institute to pursue independent funding for further work while completing a management summary covering the compliance phase fieldwork. This summary was submitted December 1988.

During the month of August and into September 1988, the Institute worked with Senators Glenn McConnell and Herbert Fielding to secure funding through the State's Contingency Fund. Additional funding was promised, and in October of 1988, the Institute returned to Folly Island. This work lasted over one month, and SCIAA was able to intensively investigate 38CH964, and to sample areas between 38CH920 and 38CH966. This final phase of excavations was directed by James B. Legg. Again, expert help came from The Charleston Museum and from volunteers throughout the area, including relic collectors.

From November 1988 until July 1989, the Institute worked to complete this comprehensive report of all archaeological investigations it conducted at sites 38CH920, 38CH964, 38CH965, and 38CH966. For the reader's convenience, each separate field investigation has been referred to as a phase (Phase I: Salvage of 38CH920; Phase II: Data Recovery at 38CH964, 38CH965, 38CH966; and Phase III: Return to 38CH964, and Environments of 38CH966 and 38CH920). It is important to keep in mind that initially, three phases were not planned, and that the authors use this term only to clarify when a particular activity occurred.

This report should represent only the beginning of scholarly research on Folly Island's Civil War period. The potential for additional research is great, especially in integrating the physical anthropological findings with the historical and archaeological record. Literally volumes of historical records exist, hidden in national and state archives, awaiting the return of researchers. What SCIAA's findings clearly demonstrate is that despite modern occupation, and a steady invasion of private collectors, important, intact deposits from the Union occupation of Folly Island still exist for the archaeologist to recover and study.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area is located on Folly Island, South Carolina, an Atlantic Coast barrier island six miles due south of Charleston, South Carolina (Figure 1.1). Folly Island is 6.25 miles long (southwest to northeast) by .5 miles wide, and its maximum elevation above mean sea level (MSL) is 15 feet. The island is comprised of three physiographic features: 1) ocean front sand dunes, 2) interior dune ridges, and 3) back island tidal marsh adjacent to the Folly River. The sites investigated are situated on the highest part of the island, on two interior dune ridges, and along the back tidal marsh bordering the Folly River. Though the beach has suffered severe erosion since the war, surprisingly, Civil War period maps (Figure 2.2) show the same three major ocean front and interior dune ridges seen today. This indicates that if the interior was used agriculturally after the war, no major modifications took place. Thus, the only major changes in local topography after the Civil War encampment were from logging.

Soils in the project area consist of the Crevasse-Dawhoo complex on the interior dune ridges, and the Capers series in the tidal marsh to the north (Miller 1971: 8-12). The Crevasse-Dawhoo soils are described as excessively drained grayish-brown fine sand (A1 horizon 10YR5/2), underlain by brownish-yellow to very pale brown (C1 10YR6/6) fine sand. The Capers series is a dark gray (5YR4/1) silty clay to silty clay loam, poorly drained and saturated with salt water. Archaeologically, the only visible difference in the natural profiles below the topsoils was that they became more coarse and slightly grayish with increasing depth. Most artifacts were found in the upper topsoil (A horizon), with features intruding deeply into the subsoils. The root mat in the topsoil was often quite thick.
Below this however, the subsoil is excellent for excavation, though unit walls gradually become unstable, and with depth, increasingly dangerous.

Generally, Folly Island falls into the South Temperate Deciduous Forest Biome, and specifically, into what Shelford (Shelford 1963: 67-68) considers the Magnolia Forest Climax. The project area is forested with a moderate understory, parts of which are quite thick in summer; but other areas are relatively open for survey. The climate is mild to temperate, with an average yearly rainfall of 49 inches. The average January temperature is 46° F, and the average July temperature is 80° F (Purvis 1983: 20-26).

RESEARCH DESIGN

Overview of Civil War Sites Archaeology

Archaeological investigation of Civil War military sites has not been extensive, but there is a growing body of literature. To date, this work has been overwhelmingly site specific in perspective. This is to be expected since so little baseline data is readily available for comparative study. At this point in the archaeological study of Civil War sites, significant contributions can be made by simply reporting data collected from a particular site. Below, a sample of the archaeological work at Civil War sites is discussed. While this overview is not exhaustive, it does represent the state-of-the-art for Civil War archaeology in the Southeast.

One can define four general site functions that have been investigated by archaeologists: 1) fortifications and other engineering sites, 2) cemeteries, 3) camps or temporary villages, and 4) shipwrecks. While battlefields could have been classified as a separate site function, all of the reported battle site archaeology actually concentrated around some fixed position. Obviously, combinations of different site functions are more the rule than the exception, and for this reason, the discussion that follows is by state rather than by site function.

Forts and fixed positions like trenches, redoubts, batteries, and other engineering sites have received the greatest amount attention from archaeologists. In South Carolina, much of this work has concentrated in and around Charleston Harbor. Stanley South has investigated Fort Johnson, a site which had been used since 1708 to protect Charleston Harbor (South 1975; South and Widmer 1976). Several forts were built within the same general area. South's work concentrated on interpreting a complex of military architecture, including an 1812 period powder magazine, barrack ruins, and Civil War earthworks (South 1975: 54-55). South also encountered a Confederate palisade at Fort Moultrie during his study of that Revolutionary War fort (South 1974: 255). Also, a possible yellow fever cemetery, dating to 1858, has been investigated at Fort Moultrie (Ehrenhard and Hsu 1977: 60).

Civil War archaeology in Georgia includes most notably the Gilgal Church battlefield (Braley 1987). Braley's interesting report on investigations at the location of the Battle of Gilgal Church, in Cobb County, Georgia, were primarily focused on three segments of a Confederate trench system at the battle site (Braley 1987: 57). Artifacts recovered indicated that the trench probably was used in preparation for combat, although no combat occurred (Braley 1987: 53). Work has also been done at the prison camp at Andersonville, Georgia, by John Walker and Guy Prentice. These efforts concentrated on the stockade and posts within the stockade trench works (Guy Prentice, personal communication May 3, 1989). A report is in preparation. The CSS Georgia, a Confederate iron-
In Louisiana, the variety of site investigations has been much greater. Fortifications at Port Hudson have been examined by Koch (1980), and Kelly and Castille have excavated Lt. Colonel Joseph Bailey’s famous dam at Alexandria, Louisiana (Kelly & Castille 1985, Smith & Castille 1986). Bailey’s dam saved Admiral Porter’s gunboats from being lost to the Confederates during the Red River Campaign. One of the more detailed reports of Civil War site investigations was completed by Goodwin, Poplin, and Hewitt (1988) on the battle of Port Bisland. While no fieldwork was conducted, the authors completed an exhaustive historic and map overview of the battle. Interestingly, much of the work concentrated on analysis of the battlefield. With this data, they developed an excellent research design and methodology for further work. One of Port Hudson’s cemeteries also has been surveyed and tested by archaeologists (Owsley, Manhein, and Whitmer 1988). This report is of special interest to the Folly Island research in that comparative data on burial patterning was included. These patterns are detailed in Chapter III.

Virginia was the scene of extensive action during the Civil War and archaeologists there have examined a large number of sites. Most of this work has been completed in compliance with the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and is confined to documentation of trench lines and other fixed positions (Bruce Lawson, personal communication May 3, 1989). One early study of a battlefield and camp area was conducted at Belle Grove Plantation (Rockwell 1974). The report primarily describes excavations around a plantation house which stands in the center of the Cedar Creek Battlefield (Rockwell 1974: 7). The artifact illustrations in this report are useful for comparative analysis.

In North Carolina, a cemetery and campground have been investigated (Phelps 1979). The cemetery dates to after the Civil War, but the information gained through archaeology there is useful for comparative analysis with the cemetery at 38CH920. The area was used by both Confederate and Union armies. Hearths and refuse pits were discovered, and the report provides excellent comparable data on both features and artifact descriptions. Off the North Carolina coast lies the remains of the USS Monitor. This famous ironclad has had much attention by archaeologists and historians (Miller 1978).

The reports cited above demonstrate that though much work has been done, there are few archaeological examinations of isolated Civil War period campgrounds. Further, the authors know of only a few efforts to examine military cemeteries of the period. These include the attempt at Fort Pillow, Tennessee, where the graves had been exhumed, and the work at Port Hudson (Owsley, Manhein and Whitmer 1988). Also included here is the work currently being conducted in New Mexico at a mass burial of Civil War soldiers (London 1989). Investigation of the Union camp and cemetery at Folly Island was, therefore, a rare opportunity for archaeologists and breaks new ground in this burgeoning field.

Folly Island Research

As has been previously stated, this project evolved into three phases: Phase I, salvage of the cemetery site 38CH920; Phase II, data recovery at 38CH964, 38CH965, and 38CH966; and Phase III, further excavation at 38CH964 and the project area. As each phase developed, SCIAA’s research design also progressively evolved. Furthermore, the direction of fieldwork was very much influenced by elements beyond pure research considerations. Phase I research, for instance, was influenced by the need to salvage burials within a construction roadway before they were destroyed. Phase II research was influenced by the findings of a survey completed to meet the requirements of state environmental laws, and the requirements of data recovery at the three National Register eligible sites. Phase III excavations offered the first real possibility of approaching research questions and the project area unhindered. However, the size of the 42 acre project area permitted the Institute to only sample the total potential of the Union camp.

All research proceeded, from the very first salvage excavations, along three simultaneous lines of inquiry: archaeology, history, and physical anthropology. Before refined archaeological questions could be approached, however, some very basic questions needed to be answered first. In some cases, the answers to these basic questions did not come until the very end of analysis. During the first phase of excavations, the initial problem was to identify, as fully as possible, the skeletal remains at 38CH920. The race and sex of the buried individuals were foremost questions, along with confirming that they were indeed Civil War period burials. After these questions were answered, it was important to try to determine which military regiments were represented. The answer to this question only came at the very end of the project, and still may not be complete.

In the second phase, the identity, function, and occupants of sites 38CH964, 38CH965, and 38CH966 were very important basic questions. Depending on the answers to all of these questions, the second and third phases appeared to offer the intriguing possibility of recovering comparative samples of material culture from both black and white units. The point to be stressed is that before such broad issues could be addressed, the answers to the funda-
mental questions were needed. On this basis, the following areas of inquiry guided, and continue to guide, archaeological research at Folly Island:

1) What burial patterning is evident? Is this pattern similar to or different from civilian cemeteries?

2) What was the cause of death of the individuals buried at the Folly Island cemetery, 38CH920?

3) What does a Civil War camp look like archaeologically? Were the military regulations followed in the layout of the camp?

4) What is the range of artifacts and artifact patterns at a Civil War camp? Is the Folly Island sample comparable to that from other Civil War sites?

5) What does the archaeology tell us about camp life for the soldiers on Folly Island?

6) What differences, if any, are recognizable in the archaeological record concerning the living conditions of black versus white units? Are such differences reflected in equipment, diet, and housing?

The primary questions posed above largely have been answered by the work discussed in this report. The broader questions have been approached, but their full answers await other comparable studies.

Beyond archaeology, physical anthropological research can expand the range of the archaeologist’s ability see into the past. For instance, a growing body of data is being gathered on black slave populations. In analyzing these data sets, very significant questions can be posed, comparing free blacks and slaves in the nineteenth century. Generally, the physical anthropological research at Folly Island was directed to the following questions:

1) What are the differences and similarities in physical traits of free blacks and slave populations (Rathbun 1987; Rose 1985)?

2) What comparisons can be made from these samples between slave/free diet, nutrition, mortality, and pathology (Steckel 1979; Rose 1985; Rathbun and Scurry 1983, Cleavenger et al. 1985; Gibbs et al.1980)?

3) How does the archaeological data (assuming a relationship between the midden sites and the cemetery) support or differ from the conclusions drawn from the physical anthropology?

Unfortunately, most of the research effort involving physical anthropology to date, has been confined to bone processing and data collection. While the above questions are addressed in this work, the analysis of the physical remains has only begun. Some baseline data is provided in Appendix A.

The historical research was geared primarily to support and supplement the archaeology and the physical anthropology. A general overview of camp life during the Civil War, and specifically at Folly Island, was developed for comparison with the archaeological record. Further historical research on the 55th Massachusetts Regiment was done to confirm that the skeletal remains recovered were indeed those of the 55th. Once the 1st North Carolina Colored Infantry was also identified in the project area, the research expanded to include that unit. The primary research questions to be asked from archival investigations were:

1. What do the historical documents reveal about camp life on Folly Island?

2. What is the history of the 55th Massachusetts Regiment and the 1st North Carolina?

3. Do historical burial records exist for these units?

4. Why were the skeletal remains not complete at 38CH920? Were they looted, or disturbed by other forces?

5. What military units occupied sites 38CH964, 38CH965, and 38CH966?

Chapter VI provides an overall summary of the above questions and offers recommendations as how future research can move toward broader anthropological studies using the data presented.

METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the general and standard methods used to meet the project goals, to order the work, and to answer the research questions posed. Unique field methods, or deviation from the field methods discussed here, are noted within each site description. As is noted below, deviations occurred primarily as a result of opportunities and/or time limitations. They were also due to the transition from a small two-week salvage project (Phase I), to a compliance project (Phase II), and finally, to a limited research project (Phase III).
Fieldwork

Archaeological investigation at each site began by setting a site datum and establishing a grid across the sites. Each site datum was later tied to a permanent monument. Site 38CH920 was tied to the contractor's central control point on W. Indian Avenue by professional surveyors, and thus also to the project map (Figure 1.2). Sites 38CH964, 38CH965, and 38CH966 were tied to a permanent monument also marked on the developer's project map. As a cross reference, site 38CH966 was tied to the datum, set at 38CH920. From the site data points, the grids for each site were oriented to Magnetic North.

The primary method of site investigation involved systematic shovel testing and block excavation. Shovel tests were consistently 50 x 50 cm in size, usually excavated to 80 cm or greater below surface and fill always was screened. At 38CH920, slot trenching was also performed along grid lines. These trenches were a shovel width (approximately 30 cm) in size and excavated to at least 80 cm in depth. Soil from all slot trenches was screened. Screening was conducted using 1/4 inch hardware cloth. Slot trenching proved most useful for finding burials at 38CH920.

Block excavation was conducted in 1 x 1 m, 1 x 2 m, and 2 x 2 m units. Excavation proceeded at arbitrary 10 cm or 20 cm levels until features were observed, and then cultural stratigraphy was followed. All unit soil was shovel-skimmed or troweled to culturally sterile soil, and except where noted at 39CH920, all soil was screened through 1/4 inch hardware cloth. Elevations were taken at the four corners of the excavation unit, using a control elevation stake, usually in the northwest corner. Control stake elevations were then recorded by transit. At least a half-gallon of feature soil from all wells at 38CH964 and 38CH966 was collected for flotation and 38CH966 was used for cultural stratigraphy was followed. All unit soil was shovel-skimmed or troweled to culturally sterile soil, and except where noted at 39CH920, all soil was screened through 1/4 inch hardware cloth. Elevations were taken at the four corners of the excavation unit, using a control elevation stake, usually in the northwest corner. Control stake elevations were then recorded by transit. At least a half-gallon of feature soil from all wells at 38CH964 and 38CH966 was collected for flotation and 38CH966 was used for flotation. Formal, controlled excavation of three wells at 38CH964 had to be halted at the water table, and hand (literally) excavation and probing were then conducted, with backhoe and water pumps providing needed support.

Excavation of the burials at 38CH920 required a slightly different methodology. After discovery, either by shovel testing or slot trenching, a 2 x 2 m excavation unit was opened over each grave and expanded as necessary to expose the burial outline completely in plan. Since the original topsoils had been removed by a bulldozer, the loose disturbed soil above a grave was cleared, and shoveling continued without screening, until the burial outline was observed. Excavation of the unit ceased at this point. The burial outline was recorded and photographed. The elevation of this outline was recorded. Controlled excavation then continued within the burial outline and the soil was screened. The burial fill was shovel-skimmed or troweled until skeletal material or coffin remains were encountered. At this point, trowels, brushes, and wooden tongue depressors were used to expose the burials. The tongue depressors proved to be most useful in the loose sandy soils, exposing the bone without damaging it. Soil samples (300 milliliters), were taken from within the grave, and where possible, within the abdomen or thoracic area.

The exposed skeletal materials were drawn and photographed. After completion of in situ documentation, each skeletal element was wrapped in newspaper and placed in burial boxes for transport to the Institute in Columbia, South Carolina. Upon arrival, the bone was removed from the newspaper, allowed to slowly stabilize by air drying, and then packed in conservation tissue.

Other supplementary excavation methods included backhoe scraping and clearing. At site 38CH920, Carolina Archaeological Services, Inc., used a backhoe to excavate trench lines while exploring for burials. The Institute also used a backhoe to scrape and clear areas at 38CH920, 38CH964, and 38CH966. At 38CH964 it was used for safe well excavation. The Institute was quite successful in using a controlled metal detector survey at 38CH964 to locate features and material just below the surface. This was conducted by walking systematic transects across the site with the metal detector and recording the location of diagnostic artifacts found.

Standard recording procedures were employed throughout the field investigations. All features, and any level plan or profile that provided useful data were drawn to scale. Unit levels were photographed, regardless of their productiveness, as were features. Excavation units and discovered features were tied to a site map, with field information recorded on the appropriate forms by level. Soil colors were described by consulting the Munsell Color chart. Field Directors maintained a field book, as did the Principal Investigator. The Principal Investigator also used a pocket tape recorder. This proved useful for keeping miscellaneous data, but was not an adequate substitute for a field notebook.

Recovered artifacts were packaged in plastic and paper bags by provenience. Fragile items were placed in small plastic vials. Large items, for instance a shovel and a ration can, were removed in soil matrix for the conservator to 'excavate' at SCIAA. One large barrel was kept moist in a plastic garbage can for transport back to the Institute Conservation Facility in Columbia, South Carolina.

Laboratory

Artifacts were washed, sorted, stabilized, and cataloged by site and provenience. A special catalog sheet for Civil War period material was developed by Lisa O'Steen and modified by James B. Legg. Because there was the opportunity to derive much important archaeological data from a tightly dated site, a great amount of time was spent...
in mending ginger beer and wine bottles (Chapter V). Metal artifacts were drawn and/or photographed prior to conservation. A conservation processing card was maintained for every artifact to be conserved. Soil samples were saved for later flotation. Artifacts were re-bagged in plastic or paper for curation at SCIAA, following in-house standards and guidelines.

All human bone was dry-brushed, damaged elements reconstructed whenever possible, and a complete inventory of the skeletal elements was maintained. These materials were then transported to the University of South Carolina’s Department of Anthropology for further cleaning and analysis by Dr. Ted Rathbun. Completeness of each skeleton varied considerably due to previous disturbance (see Chapter III). Too frequently the cranium and other significant portions were missing. Variation in completeness complicated direct statistical comparisons and reduced the accuracy of diagnosis. Bone samples were collected for chemical analysis. Samples of pathology were collected for the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology in Washington, D.C. Further discussion of the methods used in the skeletal analysis are presented in Appendix A. On May 29, 1989, the remains of the soldiers were reburied at the Beaufort National Cemetery in Beaufort, South Carolina. The remains were wrapped in plastic, sealed in a plastic liner, and placed in authentic pine box coffins for reburial. A plastic numbered tag was inserted into the plastic liner and the location of each burial was referenced for the future.

Faunal materials were washed at SCIAA and rough sorted into probable diagnostic bone elements. This large sample was then shipped to the University of Tennessee for analysis by Lynn Snyder. Her report and specialized methods are presented in Appendix B. Two samples of oyster shells were analyzed by Dr. David Lawrence of the Department of Geological Sciences at the University of South Carolina (Appendix C).

Documentary Research

Documentary research proceeded in two related directions. A general historical overview was prepared by Chris E. Fonvielle, Instructor at East Carolina University, North Carolina. His research was directed toward providing a historic context for the siege of Charleston. He also searched for any supplementary information concerning the 55th Massachusetts Regiment. Meanwhile, James B. Legg and the Principal Investigator continued archival research focused on the 55th Massachusetts and the 1st North Carolina Colored Infantry. Research materials at the following facilities were reviewed:

- Thomas Cooper Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina
- South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina
- South Carolina State Library, Columbia, South Carolina
- South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina
- Richland County Public Library, Columbia, South Carolina
- Archives and Manuscripts Department, East Carolina University Library, Greenville, North Carolina
- U.S. National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D.C.
- Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts
- George Fingold Library, State House, Boston, Massachusetts
- Massachusetts National Guard Supply Depot, Natick, Massachusetts

The following facilities or people were consulted:

- U.S. Army Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, Pennsylvania
- Dr. Francis Lord, Professor Emeritus, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina
- Dr. Stephen Wise, U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot Museum, Parris Island, South Carolina
- Mr. A. Torrey McLean, North Carolina Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina

Readers will note that footnotes accompany the text in Chapter II: Historical Background. While this is a non-standard practice in archaeological reports, the authors recognized this inconsistency as necessary for the proper citation of historical documents regarding this complex campaign. Far more historic documents and manuscripts were collected than could easily be analyzed and discussed in the time frame necessary for completing this report. Information on the 55th Massachusetts is available to complete an extensive regimental history. It is hoped that future funding can be obtained to publish this important information.