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ABSTRACT

The Carolina Backcountry is a temporally and geographically defined area reaching westward from the Carolina Lowcountry and its center, Charleston. For roughly a one hundred year span between the late seventeenth century and late eighteenth century it was a frontier and contact zone for colonists and indigenous groups. The Backcountry has sometimes been considered culturally and socially retarded, lacking the material refinement found in the colonial center of Lowcountry Charleston, South Carolina. Often landed estates in the eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry have been portrayed as one side of a dichotomy between refinement and local, rural folk craft traditions. I propose that instead, Backcountry inhabitants engaged in local production alongside regional and trans-Atlantic trade and participated in maintaining folk traditions as well as broader social movements through their many social connections.

In my thesis I use archaeological remains from Silver Bluff, a trading post and plantation located along the Savannah River, near present day Aiken, to evidence a consumption pattern of socioeconomic variability in the eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry. To do this, I analyze the archaeological assemblage from the trading post and plantation. I then compare the material assemblage and consumption patterns from Silver Bluff to contemporaneous plantations in the Carolina Lowcountry. The comparison sites include Yaughan, Curriboo, and Middleburg plantations, each of which has been catalogued in to the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery
(DAACS) database. Although contrasting elements among these sites exist (as will be explained), these sites have been selected based on general functional and temporal similarity and the idea that artifacts can reveal the social and economic systems in which their possessors engaged. The assemblage from Silver Bluff shows statistically significant ceramic ware type diversity, indicating a richness of material culture not present at the other sites. This finding indicates that the inhabitants of the sites had multiple modes of access and greater opportunity for choice than those of the comparative sites (likely a result of the site's trading post function.) I extrapolate this finding to suggest that the eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry was not socioeconomically "backward," but was socially and economically cosmopolitan.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I state my research question, introduce the data sources I use in my study, and provide the layout of the document. In this thesis, I undertake a consumption study of Silver Bluff, an eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry (the colony's "frontier") trading post and plantation. I then compare the results to four sites located in the Carolina Lowcountry (the colony's "core") to argue against the Eurocentric notion of urban centers as sole bases of civility by demonstrating that cosmopolitanism (multiethnicity alongside a multifaceted economy) was a widespread phenomenon that extended to colonial frontiers.

1.1 STATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTION

The Carolina Lowcountry is a culturally and geographically defined area centered around Charleston (the colonial capital) and bordering the Atlantic Ocean. The Carolina Backcountry, on the other hand, reaches westward from the Carolina Lowcountry into the piedmont (where it met "Indian Land") and comprised the western boundary of the Carolina Colony. For roughly a one hundred year span between the late seventeenth century and late eighteenth century the Backcountry was a frontier and contact zone for colonists and Native Americans (Crass 1999 et al.). The Backcountry has sometimes been
considered culturally and socially backward, lacking the material refinement found in the colonial center of Lowcountry Charleston, South Carolina (Crass et al. 1999). Too often landed estates in the eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry have been portrayed as one pole in a dichotomy between refinement (associated with possession of imported luxury goods) and "simple," traditional rural folkways (represented by locally produced goods) (Beck 1998, Crass et al. 1999, Groover 1994). I propose that instead of being socially backwards and economically unsophisticated, the Backcountry was socioeconomically cosmopolitan. This cosmopolitanism is evidenced through multi-vocal, fluid social identities, which are reflected in consumer choices as accessed through relations with multiscalar (regional and global) trade networks as well as localized production.

Such cosmopolitanism is not unique to Lowcountry entrepôt Charleston or the Carolina Backcountry, but existed throughout the eighteenth century Colonial World; a world that incorporated actors in Europe, the Americas, and Africa. It encompassed not only those lands and their coasts, but also the space in between. Colonial borders were not concrete, but fluid, allowing for continual transformation within individuals and households. These metamorphoses had effects that reverberate regionally and globally. More than anything, the colonial world was unified by its heterogeneity and the complex movement of people, goods, and ideology that not only received, but also transfigured one another (Fogleman 2013).

In this thesis, I undertake a study of material culture, a concept best understood as tangible goods that evidence access (i.e. production and exchange networks) and express the choices of their possessor (Miller 1987). Material culture expresses interconnectedness and works on a variety of scales in a way that enables a single site's
assemblage to become more meaningful as inter-site comparisons increase. For example, items such as expensive porcelain teawares and other imported European goods are evidence of participation in the Consumer Revolution (also known as the Georgian Revolution [Mullins 2011:139]), a movement beginning sometime during the seventeenth century (Carson 2013, Hancock 1998) through at least 1800 (Hancock 1998), but likely into the nineteenth century (Berg 2004, Galle 2010, Miller 1987). In this movement manners, behavior, and materials were linked through status judgments (Berg 2004, Carson 2013, Crass et al. 1998, Lewis 1999, Mullins 2011). Conversely, coarse earthenwares and clay pipes likely produced by Native Americans and enslaved African Americans (Kelly et al. 2011:252, Ogundiran and Falola 2007, Orser 1990:116, Singleton 1990:74) are taken as evidence of the maintenance of folk traditions. While cultural traditions, be they local-folk or consumable imports, are maintained, so too do they overlap, inform and influence one another (Feeley 2013, Hauser and Curet 2011, Ogundiran and Falola 2007).

Thus, I show that the Backcountry participated in localized production of goods (a means of expressing autonomy), regional exchange (thereby creating situationally constructed relations with both indigenous and other colonial groups), and global trade (primarily by way of England and possibly other colonies) thorough a consumption study. Archaeologically based studies of consumption are a means of determining the degree to which these traditions intersected and social categories were defined. I argue that in the Carolina Backcountry archaeological remains are evidence of multi-scalar material consumption and localized production within a colonial-era trans-Atlantic network, a network that is inherently socially and economically cosmopolitan
incorporating mass consumption alongside local industry and broad ideology in dialogue with smaller-scale interrelations.

1.2 DATA SOURCES

In this thesis, I use archaeological remains from Silver Bluff trading post and plantation to evidence socioeconomic variability in the eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry. To do this, I analyze the archaeological assemblage from this eighteenth century frontier estate in the Savannah Valley to identify patterns of material consumption. I then compare the material assemblage and consumption pattern from Silver Bluff to contemporaneous estates in the Carolina Lowcountry. The comparison sites include Yaughan I, Yaughan II, Curriboo, and Middleburg, all of which are included in the DAACS (The Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery) database.

DAACS

DAACS is an ongoing collaborative web-based project conceived, built, and housed at Thomas Jefferson's Monticello in which archaeologists from an array of institutions contribute data for inter-site comparative use. It consists primarily of artifact and site data from locations in the Chesapeake, Carolinas, and Caribbean with the aim of advancing historical understandings and evolution of the slave-based colonial and antebellum Atlantic World (DAACS 2014).

DAACS is an attribute-driven cataloging system, which provides a standardized baseline for comparative studies. Each artifact in DAACS has been thoroughly analyzed along a prescribed set of parameters by trained analysts, thus ensuring minimal error,
bias, and deviation. Not only does this provide consistent comparisons among individual artifact types and forms, it also allows for the use of multi-site statistical analyses that have been thoroughly tested. In other words, each provenience, artifact, and artifact group from a variety of sites excavated by different individuals in their own particular way for their own unique purpose at different points in time can be compared on a standardized set of criteria.

Further, the DAACS internet-based model provides data sets that are more easily massaged into meaningful interpretations with less data loss than traditional means (which sometimes require complete exclusion of categories based on differing typologies, for example) founded on solid and transparent coding operations that may be readily reproduced using outlined methodology and open sourced statistical software packages.

*Silver Bluff (circa 1740-1780)*

Silver Bluff is my contribution to the DAACS database. The site is located in Aiken County, South Carolina, on the Savannah River, near present day Augusta, Georgia. Much of it is currently a National Audubon Society Sanctuary. In addition to a prehistoric element, the site contains a colonial period Carolina Backcountry trading post and plantation (Forehand et al. 2004, Groover and Forehand 1999). Silver Bluff Plantation (also known as Galphin’s Trading Post) was owned and run by George Galphin, an immigrant from Northern Ireland, prominent trader, and Native language interpreter for the colonial government (Forehand et al. 2004, Hamer 1982). Galphin’s relationships with governmental, settler, and indigenous groups, along with the geographic proximity to the river and the ease of transport associated with it, enabled his
trading post at Silver Bluff to flourish. This success eventually enabled him to establish his plantation where he used enslaved labor to produce corn, indigo, and tobacco (Forehand et al. 2004).

**Yaughan I (1740's-1790's)**

The Yaughan I site is the earlier of two plantation sites called Yaughan. Although the two Yaughan sites are on the same land, they were separate occupations and were differentiated from one another at the time of excavation by unique site numbers; Yaughan I is site number 38BK76 and Yaughan II is site number 38BK75. In my thesis, I have chosen to refer to them as Yaughan I and II rather than by their site numbers.

Yaughan I was a rice and indigo plantation located just three-quarters of a mile from Curriboo in Berkeley County, South Carolina (Wheaton and Garrow 1985). It was owned by Isaac Cordes and remained in his family until 1836. In addition to a main house, the plantation's structures included an overseer's house and a number of quarters for enslaved individuals, as well as several outbuildings (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).

**Yaughan II (1780s-1820s)**

Yaughan II is the later of the two Yaughan plantation occupations. Initially discovered during a cultural resource management survey, the site contained the remains of five definitive structures and two possible others, including multiple slave dwellings (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).
Curriboo (1740-1800)

Curriboo is located between Lake Moultrie and the Santee River near the town of St. Stephens, Berkeley County, South Carolina, a mere three-quarters of a mile from Yaughan. Isaac and Thomas Cordes established it as an indigo and rice plantation circa 1740. Within three years of its founding Thomas had full ownership, at which time he died and bequeathed the plantation to his son Samuel. The site remained in the Cordes family until the mid nineteenth century. In addition to a main house, the plantation's structures included naval stores (related to turpentine, pitch, and tar production), an area of brick manufacture, and multiple slave dwellings (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).

Middleburg Village (1690's-1889)

Middleburg Plantation is one of the oldest plantations on the East branch of the Cooper River in the South Carolina Lowcountry, an area noted for the density of its vast rice fields owned by a closely-knit group of families and the individuals whom they enslaved. In the 17th century the Simon family owned Middleburg. The next century brought two other families: the Lucas family and the Ball family. Each of these families was related (sometimes by marriage), as were many of the individuals enslaved by them. These interrelations evidence a complex Lowcountry plantation society reliant on and interconnected with its enslaved individuals (Ferguson 2009).

The site contains twelve cabins in addition to the plantation house, storehouses, dependencies, and domestic and industrial related accouterment. The industries of Middleburg including blacksmithing, tanning, cooperage, shoe- and saddle-making, spinning, lumbering, dairying, husbandry, and agricultural endeavors including oats,
peas, and corn in addition to rice. The plantation's owners also had businesses and dwellings in Charleston (Ferguson 2009).

Comparative Study Caveats and Pilot Study

I must mention contrasting elements among the comparison sites. The primary difference is in the sites' habitation types. At Silver Bluff, most of the comparative assemblage comes from an architectural feature and a palisade suggested to be related to the first of two main houses on the site (Forehand et al. 2004, Groover and Forehand 1999). At Yaughan I and II, Curriboo, and Middleburg the assemblages are more closely related to habitations of the enslaved. Still, these sites have been selected based on functional and temporal similarity and the idea that the master-slave relations that were part of the lived experience at each can be seen in their material assemblages. In addition, each site contains several outbuildings, which affect the overall assemblages bringing them closer to what has been analyzed for Silver Bluff. Moreover, the provenance of the architectural feature at Silver Bluff is uncertain due to factors such as proximity of the palisade to the feature (Fraser Neiman, personal communication); as the methodology and analysis chapters show, Silver Bluff contains little in the way of chronological seriation and, as such, is considered on a site-wide basis rather than on a particular structure. As such, each of the other sites is also considered as a whole unit, rather than as particular structures.

The selected sites are compared across artifact categories as defined by the DAACS system, including the ceramic assemblage, as well as tobacco pipes. The high fragmentation of glass and faunal materials, and the low number of buttons, buckles, and
beads in the assemblage I studied from Silver Bluff, have precluded these from my analyses (except in the case of glass, which is used only as a baseline measure for ceramics abundance indices as described in later chapters). Although each of these artifact groups evidence consumer choices and reveal information about actions, I focus on only those groups in which statistical analyses are able to identify qualifying points of assemblage uniqueness or similarity. (Though one might expect large numbers of buttons, buckles, and beads in a cosmopolitan space, my sample does not indicate that this is the case. It is possible that other areas of the site contain more of these items, that these are simply not as well preserved as other types of artifacts, or that they are underrepresented due to sampling error [for example, beads may not be caught in 1/4" screen and buckles may be too heavily corroded and/or fragmentary to identify].) My analyses include using mean ceramic dates and tobacco pipe bore diameters to establish an intrasite chronology for Silver Bluff and abundance indices in order to address possible intersite disparities in sample size and temporality.

A pilot study I performed with Dr. Charles Cobb and Tammy Herron (Joy et al. 2015) suggests that the assemblage from Galphin’s home shows statistically significant artifact type diversity, particularly in the ceramic category. My thesis builds off of these findings and others (Groover 2014). I hypothesize that the diverse artifact assemblage from Silver Bluff indicates a richness of not only material culture, but also social and economic cosmopolitanism. Based on my analyses, Silver Bluff’s assemblage shows statistically significant abundance in the ceramic category at an earlier date than the other sites. Although the site’s differing assemblages are may be related to divergent functionalities, inhabitants, and time periods, it also seems clear that Silver Bluff played
an important role as a cosmopolitan economic center and social mediator in eighteenth century Carolina, which impacted consumption patterns at the site.

1.3 Overview of Thesis Layout

In order to understand the consumption behaviors of Silver Bluff's inhabitants, I first contextualize their world in Chapter Two by providing background information about the Carolina colony (both Backcountry and Lowcountry), followed by Silver Bluff Trading Post and Plantation and its founder, George Galphin. Chapter Three outlines the theoretical framework I use and provides a review of the relevant literature. A frontier/borderland focus is implemented alongside studies of culture change, trans-Atlantic cosmopolitanism and economic complexity. A consumption study explains the way objects are linked to people through production, consumption, and ascribed symbolism and the way in which people's choices and actions link materials to public discourses by expressing social behaviors, relations, and distinctions.

In Chapter Four I describe the archaeological excavations undertaken at Silver Bluff, then go on to outline the methodology I use in this study including the attribute-based artifact analysis protocol established and upheld by DAACS. This same protocol was used on each of the assemblages and sites compared within my study. I also outline the procedures I use to determine the site's chronology including the creation of a Harris Matrix and correspondence analysis on both ceramics and tobacco pipes. Abundance indices are then used as a means of comparing the five sites ceramics assemblages. Limitations of the analyses are provided.
In Chapter Five I discuss the results of my analyses and in Chapter Six I interpret these results and explain the way in which they support my thesis: the eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry was a space of socio-economic complexity. Diversity in Silver Bluff's material assemblage shows that complexity existed not only among people, but also in their consumer goods indicating a cosmopolitan Backcountry lifestyle. This cosmopolitanism reflects the importance of the site as regional economic center and cultural mediator among the neighboring settlements, Charleston, and the wider Colonial World.
CHAPTER 2
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

I begin this chapter by providing background information about the Carolina colony, an endeavor that grew out of Britain's agenda of expansion. Next, I explore the history of each of the Carolina plantations I use in my comparative study: Silver Bluff Trading Post and Plantation, as well as Yaughan I and II, Curriboo, and Middleburg plantations. I then provide a case study of Silver Bluff owner George Galphin and discuss some of the ceramic ware types found in the Silver Bluff assemblages as a means of exploring the human relationships that inform the site's material culture and the way in which these connections link the trading post and plantation to the wider world.

2.1 THE CAROLINA COLONY

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century North American colonies were broad, poorly defined areas claimed by the rival empires of Spain, France, and Britain (Edelson 2013). The colonies were not sudden innovations, but were established in order to expand preexisting projects. In the case of the Carolina colony, the preexisting project was the Barbadian enterprise; Carolina was formed in hopes of expanding the successes of the Caribbean sugar industry (Roberts and Beamish 2013).

England’s colonial claim on Carolina was realized by the arrival of settlers in the 1660s and 1670s. With settlement, the colony initiated the process of establishing borders
between British and Spanish territories. By 1720 the southern Carolina border was
defined by the Altamaha (St. George) River and the western border was demarcated by
the Appalachian Mountains (Edelson 2013). As geographical borders were clarified,
colonial interests centralized and the Carolina Frontier (also referred to as the
Backcountry) was established.

Even as efforts were made toward delineation, the Carolina colony remained on
the periphery of the English Empire and its boundaries were always porous (Coclanis
2005, Hahn 2013). English had limited control of the colony due to physical distance
combined with limited coercive power related to its inability to provide the colony with
more than supplemental resources (Greene et al. 2001, LeMaster and Wood 2013). The
Carolina frontier was only one of many borders the Empire had to attend and, like others,
it became increasingly autonomous over time. In most colonial settings, including
Carolina, adaptation to local circumstance was necessarily foremost and bureaucratic
schema were secondary (Hancock 1998, LeMaster and Wood 2013).

While France, Spain, and England engaged with one another, so too did
indigenous and settler groups on the Carolina frontier. The Tuscarora War of 1711 and
Yamassee War of 1715 were apogees in feuds that had grown out of long-standing
tensions related to trade and inter-personal conflicts between colonists and indigenous
groups (Feeley 2013, LeMaster and Wood 2013). (Note, however, that the term “war”
polarizes interests into defined and unified groups. In reality, groups of people were like
geographical borders, fluid. Thus, the Tuscarora and Yamassee conflicts are best
understood as a complex of overlapping aggressions stemming from individual
encounters associated with a variety of causes rather than a single clash between groups
After 1715 the Backcountry became increasingly politically, socially, and economically transformed. Colonization was, at its heart, an effort to impose Empires’ worldview and lifeways into “new” regions. Unsurprisingly, this imposition was resisted by Native inhabitants as well as settlers (who focused on adapting to local contexts rather than obliging the bureaucratic vision of England [LeMaster and Wood 2013], namely trade policies [Stern 2013]), particularly as they came to develop their own regional identities (Schnurmann 2005). As such, successful colonization required strong alliances with indigenous groups, many of which were forged through trade negotiations. These alliances would have provided a means of maintaining diplomatic relations (thereby decreasing the possibility of attack), as well as granted a means of supplying the goods necessary for sustaining a livelihood (and, through this, a degree of autonomy and independence from England) for Indian Traders.

Indian Traders living in the Backcountry also maintained relationships with European and Euro-American merchants, many of whom were based in Charleston. These merchants moved the goods received from the Backcountry (and elsewhere in the colony) into the trans-Atlantic market. Thus, mercantilism spread into the Backcountry through official Indian Traders whose primary goal was to establish and maintain diplomatic and profitable relations through trade with indigenous peoples. Still, these everyday practices of interacting with merchants who were part of the bureaucratic schema did not necessarily reflect colonists desire to further the imperial cause. Outside the realm of practical, everyday experience and interpersonal relations, groups were unhappy with the way in which the mercantilist mentality idealized market
monopolization and were resisting it by forging their own trading relationships (Stern 2013).

England’s goal of economic monopolization was based on a traditional model of plantation agricultural production that emphasized maximizing direct profit while minimizing import reliance (Stern 2013). Unfortunately for the Empire, plantation agriculture did not initially flourish in Carolina the way it had in the Caribbean and the primary sources of revenue were the indigenous slave trade (Coclanis 2005, Gallay 2002, Nyman 2011, Ramsey 2002) and, later, the deerskin trade, which required indigenous groups’ participation (Barker 2001, Stern 2013). Yet, over time (as Native peoples continually suffered the brunt of disease, conflict, enslavement, and general social and economic depression) the power balance shifted and divisions between colonists and indigenous groups became ever clearer (Feeley 2013, Hewitt 2001, LeMaster and Wood 2013, Ramsey 2001, Stern 2013). Initial reliance on indigenous groups dwindled and Charleston (the colonial power center), along with outside agents connected to Charleston (such as neighboring colonies), were more heavily relied upon by the colony to sustain itself and defend against its enemies (Hewitt 2001, Jennings 2013, LeMaster and Wood 2013, Stern 2013).

Trade Economy

Any economic system, including mercantile trade and plantation agriculture, does not solely concern capital profit. For colonial Carolina one important consideration was environmental; physical space, soil, and growing season were critical for planting success, each of which affected the colony's ability to establish and rely on an
agriculturally based economy. However, colonists were able to adapt to local environments (by adjusting crops or labor sources, for example.) Such adaptation illustrates the way in which economies are interrelated not only with environments, but also with political, social, and even ideological spheres (Mulcahy 2001, Wood 2013).

Specifically, Carolina's reliance on political and economic ties with indigenous and African groups provided a network through which they could obtain the laborers required for plantation production. The colonial slave labor system required an ideology that separated people by types and organized them hierarchically (with "whites" at the apex) (Jennings 2013). This hierarchy was, at least in part, due to the rise of naturalism. According to naturalists, variation among human groups was explained as hierarchical levels of degeneration from the ideal ancestral form. However, naturalism was more than an empirical classification scheme; it was also a philosophical school that influenced the worldview of eighteenth century peoples.

One famed eighteenth century naturalist was William Bartram. Bartram visited Silver Bluff in September 1766 (Slaughter 1996, Van Doren 1928) and it is possible that he and Galphin held similar views or at least discussed their beliefs about race and enslavement. Unlike Galphin, Bartram’s views on race are documented in his travelogue, which he wrote at the bequest of the colonial government after their decision to send men into the frontier to learn about indigenous cultures and identify whether or not it would be possible to incorporate them into British colonial society and, if it was possible, the best way to achieve this end (Van Doren 1928:2). William Bartram believed that the Creek Indians (with whom Galphin had close ties) held elements of an ancient natural state alongside European influences of civility. According to Bartram, in contrast to the
Cherokee (deemed by Bartram to be fit for enslavement) who had lost their connection to nature and only sought to imitate Europeans, the Creek (deemed not fit for enslavement) maintained a degree of purity (Slaughter 1996). Still, he apparently struggled with all indigenous enslavement and came to see it as unnatural and inconsistent with the inherent dignity of nature, a contrast to God’s plan.

While some indigenous groups counted as people worthy of integration, Africans did not. (At least, this seems to be his belief in the earlier part of his life; however, according to Slaughter [1996], Bartram later changed his view on African degeneration as a basis for low social standing as African slavery fell out of favor and was beginning to be abolished throughout the colonies.) Africans were not equated with nature in the way that Native Americans were because blackness was deemed an inherent attribute of Africans that allowed them to cool their bodies in hot climates. To many colonial minds, this attribute made them conveniently suited to plantation labor (Schiebinger 2013).

The debate about who, if anyone, was enslavable was shared not only among Bartram and religious groups (such as the Quakers), but among many 18th century people (Slaughter 1996, Van Doren 1928), including perhaps Galphin. Whether or not Bartram’s beliefs on racial hierarchy had any direct bearing on Galphin can only be conjectured upon, but it is mentioned in historical accounts that a group of 30 African and Native American slaves were used by Galphin to work his saw and grist mill, clear his land, and build his house and other structures after his arrival at Silver Bluff circa 1740 (Sheftall 1983, Vandervelde 2004).

By 1716, the colonial General Assembly had resurrected the idea of monopoly and relocated the deerskin trade interaction to forts. Merchants resisted, but prices were
standardized and negotiation and barter were forbidden (Hewitt 2001, Stern 2013). However, by 1719 merchant revolt against the proprietary government dissolved the public monopoly. Trade was still regulated, but traders went along only with particular elements (likely those that were most beneficial for themselves such as trading primarily in fortifications, which would have afforded physical protection from interlopers). Price setting, on the other hand, was largely ignored by traders.

Although the regulations were not accepted en masse, frontier traders from all sides, colonial and indigenous alike, desired structure as a means of protection against free market insecurity (Stern 2013). As the deerskin trade gave way to rice and naval stores in the early eighteenth century (Nash 1995), Backcountry traders may have feared the success of Charleston merchants that would have resulted had England's restrictions been lifted (as rice was a successful crop mainly in the Lowcountry). Meanwhile, Charleston merchants complained about the lack of barriers for entry into the dry goods trade that created competition among them and diminished individual profits (Nash 1995).

Plantation Economy

In addition to mercantilist monopolistic ideology and competition among traders and merchants, there was an issue of currency in early eighteenth century Carolina. There was not enough cash being freely circulated to meet the needs of the economy (Hewitt 2001). The government controlled the flow of wealth by lending money to planters and withholding it from the general public in order to earn interest and stabilize value through property mortgages. Land became the colony’s economic grounding and plantation

As plantations increased in social and economic value land became more and more precious and colonial borders extended outward from the area surrounding Charleston leading to ever more conflict with indigenous groups (Hewitt 2001). This situation of increased tension paralleled by increased contact is hardly unique to colonial Carolina. In fact, Carolina is but one narrative of the early modern experience in which societies were created through adaptation, contestation, and negotiation. Individual plantations such as Silver Bluff provide micronarratives of living through this transformative time.

2.2 Silver Bluff Trading Post and Plantation and Comparison Sites’ Background

In this section I provide background on my study sites: Silver Bluff, Curriboo, Yaughan I and II, and Middleburg plantations, each of which was established as an economic endeavor, but also comprised its own community with its own character. Even so, none was isolated. Instead, they were connected to one another through social and economic networks. As such, comparison studies provide a means of analyzing similarities and differences among sites to get at the broader experience of colonial life.

Silver Bluff

George Galphin established Silver Bluff Plantation and Trading Post circa 1740 after he migrated to the Carolina Colony from Northern Ireland in 1737 (Crass et al.
Silver Bluff was a place of great importance for indigenous traders as well as colonists (Groover 1994). Indigenous peoples came to the post to exchange pelts and animals for articles of European manufacture as well as to rest during long expeditions (Family papers of George Galphin [fl. 1773] MS[T] vol. bd., c. 1925, Columbiana Library, University of South Carolina, excerpt from Jones and Dutcher 1890, Hamer 1982). In addition, Galphin was often called upon to maintain peace in the Backcountry area surrounding the post and sometimes lent money to local and regional indigenous groups (Sheftall 1983).

Although the history of Galphin’s various properties is not completely unraveled, his plantation was probably well underway by the 1760s when there are reports of him producing substantial quantities of corn, indigo, and tobacco (Scurry et al. 1980:20). It should be emphasized, however, that the development of his plantation did not supplant his trading post. Native Americans were visitors to his property at least into the 1760s (Scurry et al. 1980:19-20). Thus, there was some overlap of trading post and agrarian functions in Galphin’s operations. During Silver Bluff's social and economic transition it remained an important contact locus for multiple ethnic groups with various interests and agendas.

**Yaughan I**

Yaughan I is the earlier of two plantations established by Thomas and Issac Cordes in the eighteenth century. The brothers, descendants of French Huguenots, founded Yaughan in the 1740s primarily for rice and indigo production. The plantation enterprise continued into the 1790s (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).
The archaeological investigations at Yaughan were conducted in response to a federally funded canal project, which did not include the main house as it lay outside the project perimeter. However, two slave quarters were investigated along with related sheds/storage structures. The two separate slave quarters are the basis of the split between the Yaughan occupations, which were given unique site numbers (Wheaton and Garrow 1985) and it is this area from which my data derive. This separation has been maintained in my thesis through the labels Yaughan I and Yaughan II.

**Yaughan II**

The later Yaughan slave occupation, Yaughan II, overlaps the earlier occupation by about a decade, beginning in the 1780s when the plantation's enslaved population was increased (to about eighty persons) and a second occupation area was required for housing. Within a decade, however, the population was halved and the original quarters were abandoned in favor of the newer construction. This later occupation site was inhabited into the 1820s (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).

**Curriboo**

Curriboo plantation was established in concert with Yaughan I and is located less than a mile from that property. The two plantations are often spoken of as a unit because of their proximity, identical crops (rice and indigo), and familial ties. (Thomas Cordes gained full ownership shortly after founding the plantation with his brother Isaac.) As with Yaughan, the main house at Curriboo was not investigated archaeologically and work focused primarily on the slave quarters. Unlike Yaughan, however, Curriboo had
only one slave quarter site, which was occupied from the 1740s until about 1800 (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).

The slave quarters at Curriboo were much larger than those at Yaughan. In addition to these structures, archaeologists uncovered a brick kiln and a brick pier structure (interpreted as a plantation office overlying an earlier naval store warehouse). Their findings suggest that Curriboo was a more affluent property than was Yaughan (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).

Both Yaughan and Curriboo remained in the family until the mid nineteenth century; however, they only operated as plantations until the early nineteenth century (Wheaton and Garrow 1985). At each plantation (but especially at Yaughan I), the enslaved population remained relatively stable, with few periods of additions from slave acquired from outside the Cordes family. These inherited slaves are said to have been Afro-American and "insulated from whites," such that they maintained a material culture distinct from Euro-Americans. In fact, there is evidence that colonoware (a low-fired coarse earthenware that was produced in the colonial Americas primarily by enslaved peoples, most notably the Chesapeake and Carolinas [Cobb and Depratter 2012, Groover 1994, Ogundiran and Falola 2007, Singleton 1990, Weik 2007]) was produced on-site at these two plantations (Wheaton and Garrow 1985).

*Middleburg*

Middleburg plantation is the longest-lived of the five comparison sites. It was founded in the 1690s by Lucas Ball and was maintained throughout most of the nineteenth century by related families. Middleburg is located about 25 miles north of Charleston, in the heart of the Lowcountry. Like the other Lowcountry sites (Yaughan
and Curriboo), Middleburg grew rice. However, its documented crops also include oats, peas, and corn. Many other industries existed at Middleburg including blacksmithing, tanning, cooperage, cobbling, saddling, spinning, lumbering, dairying, and husbandry (Ferguson 2009). (It is likely these endeavors also occurred on the other plantations, but they are not cited in my sources.)

The big house at Middleburg was constructed in 1699 and remains standing and privately owned today. (Incidentally, it is the oldest wooden plantation house in South Carolina [SCIWAY 2016].) Other structures present at the time of excavation include a kitchen, two barns, a smoke stack, and servants' quarters, along with a formal garden and avenue of planted oaks (these date to the first third of the nineteenth century) and rice fields. The earlier eighteenth century slave quarters were only located after numerous attempts based on a combination of oral histories, conjecture, and shovel testing; soon thereafter, a map was found confirming the site (Ferguson 1992). (Quarters dating prior to the eighteenth century remain to be discovered [Ferguson 1992]).

Leland Ferguson's 1986 excavations at Middleburg were part of a survey project that sought to learn about early slave communities on the East Branch of the Cooper River (Ferguson 1992). Three areas were investigated. In Area 1 (northeast of the big house), four one-meter square test units were dug. In Area 2, ten 50x50 centimeter test units were dug. A "ditch-witch" was used to excavate a six-inch wide trench in Area 3; this proved to be the location of the slave quarters (Ferguson 2009). After the trench excavation, eighteen additional one-meter squares (situated within and between predicted house locations) were excavated. In addition, two randomly placed one-meter squares were excavated within the hypothesized village boundaries (though twenty were placed)
and eight squares were excavated outside of the hypothesized settlement boundary. Each
of the three areas' assemblages was cataloged into DAACS and all are used in my
analyses.

Each of the five sites in my study has a unique archaeological assemblage, much
of which is reflected in my analyses. Yaughan I, Yaughan II, and Curriboo include
primarily the material residues of enslaved individuals, whereas Middleburg's assemblage
includes a broader array of items from various areas of the plantation. In contrast, Silver
Bluff's assemblage does not come from habitations for the enslaved. These habitation
differences certainly have an effect on the materials in the collections because enslaved
people had diminished access to goods and personal choice is not reflected within
selection of imported luxury wares. I hypothesize that the power of choice and ability to
gain access to the luxury objects of preference is most evident in the Silver Bluff
assemblage and that the great diversity within that assemblage may be attributed to the
many social and economic roles of the site's founder, George Galphin.

2.3 **George Galphin: Go-Between**

George Galphin, founder of Silver Bluff, was both an official Indian Trader and a
plantation owner. As a trader, he was the epitome of a go-between (as defined by Metcalf
2005). He was an Irish emigrant that made his way to the Backcountry by becoming an
Indian Trader. In this role he served as an official representative of the colonial
government and negotiated political dealings with indigenous groups. This role
necessitated the use of written documentation and resulted in a mythical aura surrounding
him. Galphin is described in historic documents as famous, awe-inspiring, and respected,
“a potentate upon whom the dusky natives of the forest looked with awe and respect” (Knight 1917:241), devoted to the American cause, a gentleman of “very distinguished talents and liberalities, who possessed…connections and influence among the South and Southwestern Indian tribes, particularly with the Creek and Choctaw” (Family papers of George Galphin [fl. 1773] MS[T] vol. bd., c. 1925, Columbiana Library, University of South Carolina, excerpt from Bartram 1792:312-313), and possessing personal integrity (Vandervelde 2004). While these commendations are clearly saturated with the Eurocentric romantic bias of his describers and there are no known indigenous narratives available to provide a subaltern account, it is almost certain that Native peoples did not view him in this paternal, patronizing way. (It is also likely that the people he enslaved had a less than rosy view of him, but, again, those views are undocumented.) Still, given his continuous dealings with indigenous groups and success at learning indigenous languages, it seems clear that at least some Native individuals held him in some esteem.

On a more personal level, upon his death Galphin bequeathed a number of his slaves, money, and goods to the nine children produced through his relations with Metawney and Nitehuckey (Creek women), Sapho (one of his slaves), and Rachel (his Huguenot mistress.) He also acknowledged and left an inheritance for Catherine (his abandoned Irish wife), with whom he had no children (Hamer 1982). Galphin’s final decree evidences the complexity of Backcountry relations as well as substantiates the legend regarding the sexual prowess of go-betweens (Metcalf 2005).

In regards to business, Galphin’s role as a cultural broker afforded him the opportunity to manipulate situations, gain a respectable reputation, and develop power. The wealth and prestige he gained during his transition from trader to planter, settler to
gentleman, originated in his position as a go-between. The transition from trader or merchant to planter was the more common direction of social transformation (Nash 2005). Distinguishing oneself as elite by conforming to standards of gentility required economic preeminence. If a trader, artisan, or storekeeper could become a planter through kin or political alliance or investment savvy he (or she, in some cases [Pruden 2001]) embodied success (Pearson 2001).

2.4 Trade Goods and Consumables

Another measure of economic success is through the accumulation of material goods, or consumption. Some consumable goods remain in the archaeological record and, when taken as assemblages, create patterns that may be compared among sites in order to identify similarities and differences about the sites' inhabitants. Consumption pattern studies at Silver Bluff have shown a ceramic assemblage that is highly varied overall in comparison to other Carolina plantations (Yaughan, Curriboo, Middleburg, Yauannah, Limerick, and Howell) (Groover 2014, Joy et al. 2015). This material diversity may be attributed to the trading post functions of the locality. The high number of ware types at the site could also indicate that Galphin’s rise in status (a socially drawn distinction) and multitude of social connections allowed him to acquire a greater variety of goods than other planters. Silver Bluff’s socio-economic cosmopolitanism evidences the fact of Atlantic refinement following European ideals of socially drawn distinction based on gentility and civility within local, regional, and trans-Atlantic contexts (Hancock 1995, 2005).
Diversity at Silver Bluff (as in the Carolina colony as a whole) existed among people and goods. Material culture expresses the utility of the Atlantic framework (which is based on the notion of material and ideological circulation within and among the continents bordering the Atlantic Ocean and the islands within it [Games 2006, Morgan and Greene 2009, Putnam 2006]), as a multiscalar sphere of interconnectedness. Silver Bluff was settled at the height of the eighteenth century consumer revolution in which manners, behavior, and materials were linked through status judgments (Crass et al. 1998, Lewis 1999). Status judgments then and now are informed not only by material items, but also by personal characteristics (Crass et al. 1998).

As discussed, Galphin was originally an Indian Trader, but as he succeeded in "going-between," he accumulated wealth and became a politician and gentleman planter. He is considered to have advanced in his social group, if not his class. With increased status came increased power, which likely changed the social standing of Galphin and the economic basis of Silver Bluff. In this way, the estate transformed from an Indian Trading Post to an Atlantic colonial plantation, reliant on agriculture and slave labor. This transition mirrored broader events in which Backcountry settlements accumulated capital and morphed from insular households to economic centers in the developing 18th century colonial system (Lewis 1999).

Carolina provided many raw materials such as indigo and cotton that were used primarily by the British in the production of finished consumer goods. Some of these goods, such as table and teawares, were luxury goods (defined by their relative expense, which meant that chiefly upper class individuals could possess them). Britain strove to reproduce the high-quality, highly refined ceramics produced at other locales (as in the
innovations of the English porcellaneous ware type, which was an effort to replicate Chinese porcelain). Demand for these items was high and Britain sought to market them in the colonies as English products rather than imported luxury goods (Berg 2004). Not only was this tactic cheaper, but it also promoted nationalism and industry as the “new consumer goods” of Britain came to be associated with modernity, an alternative to Old World trade and associated quaintness (Berg 2004:99).

During Galphin's time at Silver Bluff (the mid to late eighteenth century), Charleston was also experiencing the European chinoiserie craze, in which luxury was expressed through Asian style goods including ceramic “china”, decorative art pieces, furniture, textiles, and wallpaper (Leath 1999). These goods were available to colonists only through Atlantic trade and both Britons and colonists sought to emulate the style at home (Leath 1999) in order to express their status and fashionability.

This emulation occurred not only in Charleston and Britain, but also in the Carolina Backcountry; Silver Bluff provided more than sixty percent of the total Chinese porcelain included in Joy et al.'s (2015) four site comparative study. (The other forty percent consisted of about three times at much Chinese porcelain from Yauhannah as from Howell. Limerick plantation had no Chinese porcelain.) Thus, one Lowcountry site and one Backcountry site had the most of the luxury import Chinese porcelain in the study, while a second Backcountry side had comparatively little and a second Lowcountry site had none at all. Based on Joy et al.'s (2015) study, the Backcountry seemed to engage in material trends just as much as the Lowcountry did (though this conclusion is based on an admittedly small sample). These results illustrate that the Lowcountry-Backcountry line cannot divide possession of particular material goods, nor
the social mores that go along with those possessions. In other words, based on this example of comparative richness in Chinese porcelain, the Backcountry was no more socioeconomically backward and no less cosmopolitan that was the Lowcountry.

Similarly, delft, a tin-enamed refined earthenware of European manufacture (primarily Dutch and English, though also French), was seen as prestigious and enabled a link between colonial experience and European dining norms (Groover 1994). Most American colonial delft (likely including that of Silver Bluff) is of English manufacture (Shlasko 1997). Delft is one of the most prevalent artifacts at Silver Bluff (Joy et al. 2015). (Again, Silver Bluff's assemblage comprised the majority of the delft in the cross-site proportional distribution. Taken together Howell, Limerick, and Yauhannah comprised only about thirty five percent of the total delft.) The reason for delft's pervasiveness at Silver Bluff is unknown; however, it does not seem to be merely a function of temporality, but instead speaks to Galphin's social status. It is possible that Galphin's access to goods (including Chinese porcelain and European delft) may have been higher than other Carolina planters (which may have affected its presence site-wide at each of Joy et al.'s four comparative sites) due to his unique status as a trader with connections to the trans-Atlantic network.

Intra-colonial trade existed throughout the Atlantic. The vastness of the British colonial territory led to interior centers of manufacture for a variety of goods, including animal hides and ceramics (Steen 1999). Trading strengthened connections not only with Europe, but also within the colonies as seen by earthenwares produced in Philadelphia found in archaeological assemblages from the Caribbean, Canada, Virginia, Delaware, Massachusetts, Florida, and North and South Carolina including Charleston and outlying
Lowcountry estates (Steen 1999). However, no locale in Joy et al.'s (2015) study relied solely upon imported goods. Each site seems to have also produced its own ceramics (as well as other items such as iron hardware and food stuffs).

One example of a locally produced ceramic ubiquitous in the assemblages is colonoware. Colonoware is a low-fired, typically undecorated, earthenware sometimes possessing European forms that was produced in the colonial Americas, most notably the Chesapeake and Carolinas and usually exchanged only at short distance, if at all (Groover 1994, Ogundiran and Falola 2007, Singleton 1990, Weik 2007). It was originally attributed to Native Americans, then enslaved Africans, and the attribution debate rages on (Cobb and Depratter 2012, Singleton 1990, Weik 2007). However, it is best understood as an exchange of tradition, evidence of complex interconnection among people and realms (Cobb and Depratter 2012, Weik 2007).

Colonoware may be viewed as a material expression of its makers' autonomy (Ogundiran and Falola 2007). The presence of colonoware also indicates subsistence living and the existence of a cottage industry with, perhaps, its own regional system of supply and demand that both informs and is informed by institutions such as the colonial and Atlantic economies and consumption (Ogundiran and Falola 2007) (although it is possible that colonoware was produced at each plantation independently, in which case there still may have existed regional discourse regarding production methods and preferences).

Although Atlantic enslavement led to changes in behavioral patterns that are observable in material remains, this does not equate to a particular amount of cultural change (Agbe-Davies 2007, Kusimba 2007, Ogundiran and Falola 2007). Rather, culture
change is the result of a long-term process of identity and cultural formation that hinges on agency (Kusimba 2007, Ogundiran and Falola 2007). Individuals and groups have their own meanings and associations for objects. Although attributing particular objects to particular peoples must be done with caution, colonoware is evidence for the existence of the Atlantic multiplicity of experience; the pottery’s paste varies as greatly as the ethnic composition of the colony.

The presence of each of these ceramic ware types and the routes through which they came to be at Silver Bluff speaks to the site's function as a trading post, as well as a plantation. Galphin's business dealings would have brought in imported luxury wares for use and sale, while his inter-personal connections could have increased his modes of access to these goods as well as provided him with ware types of regional production (such as unidentified coarse earthenware, discussed in later chapters.) The site's plantation function involved housing enslaved individuals, who likely would have made colonoware on site.

Each of these points of access involve social positioning (such as professions like trading or planting) and motivations (such as a desire to appear gentile in the company of gentlemen or powerful and dependable during trade negotiations.) However, Galphin was not the only individual living at Silver Bluff and its assemblage does not reflect him alone. The many visitors and inhabitants of the site make an appearance through the presence of goods that may not have been chosen by Galphin for his own personal use. Some wares may have been for sale, while others belonged to other members of his household and his slaves who would have been serving in the big house, but likely residing in their own quarters and traveling to and fro. These multiple access points are
not unique to Silver Bluff, however Galphin's unique blend of roles may have allowed him to acquire a more diverse assemblage than the inhabitants of the other study sites.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework I use in this thesis. It is broken into three main sections: frontiers, cosmopolitanism, and material culture patterning. Each of these components informs my hypothesis that the eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry was not socially or economically backward, but was comprised of individuals from various backgrounds who were engaged in local, regional, and trans-Atlantic material and ideological exchange. This socioeconomic cosmopolitanism is reflected in the rich archaeological assemblage from frontier trading post and plantation Silver Bluff.

3.1 FRONTIERS AS SHARED SPACES

The Carolina Backcountry may be best understood as a colonial frontier. However, because pop-definitions of "frontier" imply wilderness in contrast with civility, my use of the term requires explanation. Thus, in this section I define frontier and then explore the nature of these shared places before discussing cultural brokers (frontier go-betweens) and the nature of colonization and its material residues.
The Carolina Frontier

Frontiers are the most basic and widely distributed notion of shared places. The word "frontier" is so ingrained in Western discourse that it does not seem to require definition; however, to avoid the overly Romanticized Wild West signification of the word and to clearly explain what I mean when I use the term, I provide a short background on the evolution of frontier ideology in archaeology.

Early definitions of frontiers (Groover and Cabak 2006, Lewis 1999, Zierden 1999) attempted to situate particular locations within standardized place and culture-based typologies or models, resulting in simplistic, dichotomous portrayals of frontier inhabitants as backward, socially and materially deficient, and lacking in civility and diversity. Research indicates that frontiers are not, in fact, unsophisticated contrasts to more refined locales. Frontier inhabitants actually possess and utilize both "folk," subsistence-related items and elite, imported "luxury" goods (Crass 1999, Joy et al. 2015, Lightfoot and Martinez 1995).

Further, early frontier conceptions maintained a clear "us" (colonizer, European, or Euro-American) versus "them" (colonized or indigenous). For example, the purported "English" character of colonial British North America implies that the "American Indian" population vanished from the scene to make way for English settlers and only involved indigenous peoples when it was under attack (Canny 1999:1101-1102). In such a view, frontiers are inherently places of kinetic conflict due to the imposition of foreign agendas and Native resistance, and even assaults, on "defenseless" settlers.

A more refined look at frontiers is multiscalar and enables simultaneous micro and macro examination. Frontier spaces should be examined along all of their relations as
Frontiers may be defined broadly as sites where men and women from vastly different cultures interacted (Ewen as cited in Orser 2001:627, Voss 2005) and, as a result, co-transformed each other as well as themselves through negotiating their identities within local and broader discourses. There was variation within each group as well (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995, Voss 2005).

Frontiers, reconceptualized, are zones of intersecting social networks based on overlapping segmentary or factional groups that crosscut traditionally perceived colonial-indigenous boundaries (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995). As such, frontiers are socially charged places where innovative cultural constructs are not only created or maintained, but also transformed. My use of this interpretation of "frontier" in my thesis serves as a reclamation and contemporization of the term in which the Backcountry becomes empowered with the opportunities for choice and agency. These opportunities afforded by frontier life are reflected through the diverse material assemblage of Silver Bluff.

*Brokering Shared Space*

Frontiers often have leaders who are able to negotiate and compromise with Other groups, a vital skill in spaces that are not always peaceful (Metcalf 2005, Naum 2010:116). It is for this reason that research on frontiers often employs the trope of the cultural broker, mediator, or go-between, someone (typically a White man) who is often officially appointed by the polity or group for whom he works, but is also personally invested in realizing his own agenda (Metcalf 2005). Within the trite frontier setting, this
man may be imagined as the ruggedly dapper cowboy riding in to save the day on his
noble steed.

A more realistic portrayal may be a number of key individuals who, through skill,
tact, charisma, and perhaps some degree of luck, are able to live their own lives while
simultaneously representing various interests of their allies (both personal and official)
such that the tensions inherent to shared spaces are resolved. (Silver Bluff's George
Galphin is one such individual). This kind of resolution does not imply constant hand
shaking, back patting, or handholding; instead, it often involves kinetic conflict. Rather
than White knights, these go-betweens are spokespersons with a relatively high power
over the shared space. Presuming, solely for the sake of illustration, that a space is shared
by only two clearly identifiable groups, I imagine not a duel between the hero and the
villain, but an interaction that perpetuates the larger discourses of respective interests.
While one "side" may gain and wield power to the detriment of the "other," this occurs
through a multitude of negotiations, manipulations, transactions, and conversations
among all actors within a particular area.

Colonization in Physical and Ideological Space

"Colonization," like "frontier," typically refers to a physical presence within the
territory of another society. Cultural colonization may be understood as ideological
colonization, the deliberate introduction of extraordinary goods, new technologies, and
associated practices by one society into another for the purpose of gaining political and
economic goodwill and advantage (Wells 2015:77). Ideo-cultural colonization theory
accepts that a colonizer's goods, and the ideology with which they are imbued, replace the actual physical presence of colonizing people.

Although only the material residues of cultural colonization are observed for the case of Silver Bluff in this thesis, the associated ideology would have present and can be inferred from the presence of luxury imports and locally produced goods. Many frontier inhabitants manipulated objects as a means of self-representation through their practices (Loren 2006, Schoeman 2013:613, Silliman 2010). For example, a porcelain bowl fragment uncovered at Fort Congaree was repurposed as a hide scraper after being broken, thus indicating a shift from a luxury vessel signaling high social status to a tool for use in localized participation in the deerskin trade (Stewart 2013).

Objects found in frontier settings can also indicate the ways in which people lived without attending to group boundaries (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995, Silliman 2010). For example, creamware, a ubiquitous temporal marker, may be evidence for Euro- or Euro-American culture; but, when found in a Native American household it may indicate direct or indirect participation in the European market economy and that Native Americans had the opportunity to possess and interact with "European objects" (Silliman 2010) sometimes (but not always) with intentional, specific goals in mind (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995).

The presence of a particular object, thus, does not necessarily imply colonization because spaces, objects, and ideologies are shared among and within groups. Understanding spaces as shared not only by different groups of people, but as spheres where human practices, ideas, and structures meet (a "spatialized imaginary" [Whitridge 2004]), allows us to think about the way in which we create our own spaces and how they
simultaneously form us. A "place," then, is a nexus of imaginary significations at the site of intersection with the real (Whitridge 2004:241). In plain English, shared spaces are not merely backdrops for human action, but are integrated into, and help to create, human action and structures.

3.2 TRANS-ATLANTIC COSMOPOLITANISM

In this section I explore cosmopolitanism and its varying definitions. In my introduction, I proposed that instead of being socially backwards and economically unsophisticated, the Backcountry was socioeconomically cosmopolitan. This idea of cosmopolitanism is evidenced through multi-vocal, fluid social identities, which are reflected in consumer choices as accessed through relations with multiscalar (regional, colonial, trans-Atlantic, and global) trade networks as well as localized production.

In cosmopolitanism studies, planters and intellectuals are revealed as a mobile set with broad horizons engaged with the modern world (Kaye 2009:648-649). Studies framed in cosmopolitanism have shifted away from creolist approaches emphasizing creation of new cultures and diasporic emphasis on continuities between Africa and the Americas. This shift is important because it illuminates the way in which the frameworks of creolization or African tradition continuity neglect a critical dimension of modernity: that all social identities are collective exercises in self-fashioning through every day encounters (Kaye 2009:642). Rather than suggesting that diaspora and creole may be maintained separately but in conjunction, I find that cosmopolitanism incorporates both the opportunity for innovation alongside the possibility for continuity. Whereas creolization posits culture as a synthesis and the diasporic approach traces African
conventions (Kaye 2009), cosmopolitanism provides for both of these through cultural change (which occurred in the colonial Carolina Backcountry and is reflected in its material culture). Cosmopolitanism is a descriptor for multiethnic, fluid, and interconnected spaces like frontiers (and the individuals contains therein).

Cosmopolitanism, as described here, sets the Carolina colony within the Atlantic and, more explicitly, in the context of global transformations, thus emphatically embracing the cosmopolitanism that Coclanis (2009) has called for, even if it does so within a single slice of the world (in this case, through the Silver Bluff site.) In this way a microstudy (such as an examination of the material culture of an archaeological site) can help scholars to answer larger questions about what exactly was particular to the Atlantic world and what this region shared with other areas in a transnational, trans-regional, and integrative way (Games 2006). Using an Atlantic lens moves conception beyond Eurocentric ideas of cosmopolitanism by replacing English (or other European) Cosmopolitans and their Atlantic creole counterparts with Atlantic cosmopolitans (Cañizares-Esguerra and Sidbury 2011, Games 2008, Sweet 2014) including those of South Carolina (Coclanis 2005, Leath 1999).

Note that my use of cosmopolitan does not equate the idea of cosmopolitanism and gentrification espoused by seventeenth century men's international self-fashionings as described in Carson (2013). Rather, it engages English-style gentility along with traditions, folkways, and variety of social communications. Cosmopolitanism, in my usage, refers to multiplicity of cultural mores, not the strict adherence to elite manner or the Georgian Mindset (as discussed in Deetz 1996[1977], Fennell 2011, Johnson 1999, Leone 1988, and Pogue 2001). However, it does include a component of showing
familiarity with trans-Atlantic luxury discourse (such as gentility and consumption) and the ability to engage in trade and economic mobility (Coclanis 2005, Hancock 1998, Leath 1999, Lightfoot and Martinez 1995).

Similarly, my conception of cosmopolitanism differs with Farry's (2005) in that he separates military frontiers into insular (those with connections to homeland that are attenuated over time due to their adaptation to their local socioeconomic contexts in an effort to exploit those regions) and cosmopolitan (those with strong connections to homeland, which are maintained due to their short-term, specialized nature and often involve direct manipulation by the parent state as in military settlements). This division is an effort to fit frontiers into world-systems theory (Wallerstein 1974, 1980), which maintains peripheries as subordinate to the core (Farry 2005). As discussed, I do not conceive of frontiers in this way nor do I ascribe to this idea of cosmopolitan settlements.

Cosmopolitanism, as used in this thesis, is an effort to move beyond ethnically or racially based constructions of white versus black (or European colonizer versus indigenous colonized) that overlook the diverse communities comprised of multiple statuses, nationalities, and globally rooted populations, which existed not only in port cities (like Charleston), but also in rural contexts (Armstrong and Hauser 2004).

Thus, I argue that in the Carolina Backcountry these remains reflect multi-scalar material consumption and localized production within a colonial-era trans-Atlantic network, a network that is inherently socially and economically cosmopolitan incorporating mass consumption alongside local industry and broad ideology in dialogue with smaller-scale interrelations. Silver Bluff’s socio-economic cosmopolitanism evidences the fact of Atlantic refinement following European ideals of socially drawn
distinction based on gentility and civility within local, regional, and trans-Atlantic contexts (Hancock 1995, 2005).

3.3 Consumption Patterning and Material Culture

This section clarifies the way in which I use patterns of material culture to provide a view of what the eighteenth century Backcountry experience might have been like based on the objects left behind by those who lived it. I outline different uses of patterning before exploring consumption and what it says about those who participated in it: consumers.

Silver Bluff, does not fit South's (1977) Frontier Pattern, but actually better fits the Carolina Pattern, a pattern indicative of (urban) domesticity (Scurry et. al 1980:74). So, it seems that at least some frontier sites cannot neatly fit into a frontier conception that is consistently and behaviorally divergent from other areas. It is for this very reason that the early definitions of frontier and efforts to typologize their material patterns has fallen out of favor. I argue that rather than attempting to categorize archaeological collections into particular named patterns, it is better to take assemblages as unique wholes that have similarities and differences from other sets of material culture and may be compared through these bases.

Moreover, as noted by Howson (1990) patterning lends itself to the interpretation of unidirectional culture change (for example, slaves acculturated to planter's worldviews) based on behavioral residues left in material culture. In short, patterning artifacts tends to pit them into single categories, while ignoring the possibility of cross-functionality. Thus, I do not ascribe to Patterning (South 1977) per se, but rather use
patterns to make interpretations of behaviors. For example, my discussion of Chinese porcelain teawares presume they were used in the tea drinking ritual of leisure and luxury, however (like Silliman 2010) I do not suggest that this was their sole purpose or that any person using a teacup was consciously participating in the Consumer Revolution or the Gentility Movement (terms for European-based economic and social transformations that occurred during the eighteenth century).

What I am suggesting is that material culture shows the patterns of consumption that occurred at a site, the possessions of inhabitants that reflect acquisition (or production), use, and choices, which change across time and space. Consumption is based on consumerism (the relationship between people, ideas, and objects), which is a way of studying economic product values and a way to differentiate taste, style, status, and social competition (Martin 1993). It is not limited to the life stages of the object (manufacture, use, and discard), but also includes broad structural processes of trade and ideology, which influence the way objects are conceptualized by people in particular contexts. Goods convey social status and are engaged in the process of self-definition and collective identification (Mullins 2011).

Consumption studies, thus, reflect the ways consumers negotiate the meaning of goods within particular contexts through the movement of goods throughout society (Hauser and Kelly 2011, Mullins 2011, Ogundiran and Falola 2007, Singleton 1990). These studies suggest that goods have ascribed meanings and mediate social relationships (Cook et al. 1996) and that people acquire goods to "confirm, display, accent, mask and imagine who [they] are and who [they] wish to be" (Mullins 2011:135). Consumption, understood in this way, involves both meaning and function as well as individual agency.

Groups' consumption (and production) habits are seen archaeologically through objects such as imported ceramic wares and other goods as well as locally and regionally produced goods (Kelly et al. 2011:252, Ogundiran and Falola 2007, Orser 1990:116, Shepherd 2014, Singleton 1990:74). Material culture (be it local-folk or consumed imports) is both innovated and maintained (Feeley 2013, Hauser and Curet 2011, Ogundiran and Falola 2007); studies of consumption are a means of determining the degree at which these traditions intersected.

Some studies of Backcountry material culture suggest a definitive difference between it and the Lowcountry (Crass et al. 1999, Groover 1994, Nash 1999, Shepherd 2014). While I do not dispute that differences in the colony's material culture exist, I do not believe that these differences equate to levels of social "civility" or economic "success."

My (and others' [Groover 2014, Joy et al. 2015]) study of consumption pattern studies at Silver Bluff show a highly varied overall ceramic assemblage as compared to contemporaneous Carolina plantations. This material diversity not only speaks to the economic function of the site, but also indicates that its inhabitants likely engaged in status distinctions and maintained numerous relationships (both social and economic), which are reflected through their material culture. Silver Bluff’s socio-economic cosmopolitanism includes refinement and gentility following European ideals of socially drawn distinctions. It also reflects local tradition, regional trade, and trans-Atlantic membership.
Social Distinction and Luxury Goods

Socially drawn distinctions differentiate not only various social classes but also status groups (groups expressed through lifestyle [such as gentleman] that are formed on status situations [such as property ownership] that exist within social classes [such as the elite, wealthy, upper class], which are bases for social interactions). These distinctions are formed on situations encompassing every component of life (Weber 2013[1909-1920]).

The Carolina colony had individuals from a number of social classes and status groups, including wealthy gentleman planters, middling merchants, and property-less enslaved, as well as numerous others who existed between these groups as well as, perhaps, moving among them through time or situation. For example, Galphin transitioned from trader to planter as he accrued money and developed esteem. Of course, he was not the only inhabitant of Silver Bluff; the site was a nexus of human heterogeneity.

Diversity at Silver Bluff, as in the Carolina colony as a whole, and the wider Atlantic colonial world, existed among people and goods. Material culture expresses the utility of the Atlantic framework, as a sphere of interconnectedness that works on a variety of scales. As detailed in Chapter 2, Silver Bluff was settled at the height of the eighteenth century consumer revolution in which manners, behavior, and materials were linked through status judgments (Crass et al. 1998, Lewis 1999). Status judgments then and now are informed not only by material items, but also by personal characteristics (Crass et al. 1998). For Silver Bluff, the increased status and wealth Galphin accrued came with increased power, which likely changed the social standing of Galphin and the
economic basis of his estate. This rise in status is reflected archaeologically by luxury goods, a consumer good.

One of the eighteenth century’s most notable developments is the commercial product, or consumer good (the currency of the Consumer Revolution). These products are the creation of a discourse among exporters, wholesalers, retailers, peddlers, customers, and producers that make choices about distribution and desire. These are decentralized, discursive, and reciprocal processes that occur among agents and arose with the Atlantic World (Hancock 1995, 1998, 2009, Hauser and Curet 2011). Production of consumer goods was an economic and social act that expanded channels of distribution and increased consumption behavior (Hancock 1995, 1998, 2009).

Consumption is not a simple interaction between cultures or individuals, but a dynamic exchange between groups (Curet and Hauser 2011). Identifying consumption behavior before assuming ownership, production, or investment is key to understanding the ways in which agents interrelate. While constructing physical and conceptual boundaries (like frontiers, the Consumer Revolution, Georgian Mindset, or Gentility Movement) is necessary for creating comprehensible units of contemplation and comparison, it is also a simplification of the inherent complexity of spaces and the behaviors that occur within them.

Madeira wine is an exemplary case of the rise of consumable production. It was “invented” between 1703 and 1807 with a general rise in consumption among the European diaspora (Hancock 1998, 2009). While Madeira consumption at Silver Bluff is undocumented, it was certainly present in South Carolina. It is documented that in the Carolina colony a pale, dry, heavily fortified version was preferred (Hancock 1998:207).
Achieving this particular taste required innovations in processing and a reliance on consumer loyalty based on social desires. (Specifically, as esteem increased, the Madeira became more expensive. In response, counterfeits were produced and varying grades were made in order to increase accessibility to a variety of consumers. The differentiating grades of wine became linked to hierarchical social status [Hancock 1998, 2009].) This entanglement among agents and processes that created enmeshment of objects and identity, is not limited to wine, but occurred in a number of trade goods, including the archaeologically recoverable category of ceramics, the basis of my consumption study.

Rather than envisioning the Backcountry, Carolina, or the colony endeavor itself, as being spokes of the Imperial wheel, they should be understood on their own terms: as spaces that developed their own history and culture through autonomy and resistance alongside emulation and conformity. Its people affected the world as much as they were affected by it. Just as the Atlantic World is more than a European test tube, the Backcountry is more than an emulation of Charlestonian grandeur or a pocket of localized subsistence; it is a cosmopolitan, multicultural entanglement and this is reflected in its material culture.
CHAPTER 4

ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

In this section I provide a summary of the archaeological excavations that took place at Silver Bluff Trading Post and Plantation. While all excavations are mentioned, I pay particular attention to the 1999 field season, as this is the period in which the materials I analyzed in my thesis research were uncovered. In addition, I provide details on the laboratory procedures I used including DAACS artifact cataloging methodology and statistical analyses. These analyses include seriation based on both mean ceramic dating (a way of determining a provenience's age based on the average age of its ceramics) and pipe stem bore diameter chronology, and correspondence analysis. Finally, I describe my use of abundance indices in comparing ceramic assemblages from Silver Bluff and four South Carolina Lowcountry sites in order to evaluate my hypothesis that Silver Bluff's diverse material assemblages suggest that the eighteenth century was a time of Backcountry socioeconomic cosmopolitanism.

4.1 FIELD EXCAVATIONS AT SILVER BLUFF

The Silver Bluff site is located in Aiken County, South Carolina, on the Savannah River, near present day Augusta, Georgia. Much of it is currently a National Audubon Society Sanctuary. In addition to a prehistoric element, the site contains a colonial period

The site was first investigated between November 1979 and March 1980 by the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, the University of South Carolina, Aiken, and the Augusta Archaeological Society. This examination consisted of a systematic ground surface collection survey (Scurry et al. 1980:2). A second investigation, conducted in 1996 by the Savannah River Archaeological Resource Program (SRARP), University of South Carolina, included a series of test pits and the implementation of ground penetrating radar.

Another excavation occurred in May and June of 1999 by the SRARP in conjunction with Augusta State University and the National Audubon Society’s Silver Bluff Plantation Sanctuary. The three institutions came together to sponsor an archaeological field school for the excavation (Forehand et al. 2004:58). This endeavor is the source of the information contained within the DAACS database, although further efforts to gather information about the site occurred in 2003 in the form of various remote sensing attempts as well as a cooperative effort summer camp sponsored by the SRARP and the Continuing Education Program at the University of South Carolina, Aiken (Forehand et al. 2004:69).

4.2 LABORATORY METHODOLOGY

The laboratory methods I utilized were based on those established by DAACS. DAACS has detailed manuals for cataloging each artifact type group: ceramic, glass vessel, faunal, tobacco pipe, button, buckle, bead, and all other artifacts (all of DAACS
manuals are available at http://www.daacs.org/about-the-database/daacs-cataloging-manual/). Cataloging into the DAACS database requires certification based on extensive training and communication with DAACS staff, a material culture quiz, and periodic quality control checks. Only individuals that have met these requirements and maintain the standard of quality prescribed by DAACS staff are permitted to catalog into DAACS. This rigorous system enables intrasite comparisons through a standardized data scheme.

For ceramics, dozens of attributes are entered into the database. These include:

- count
- ware type, material (coarse or refined earthenware, stoneware, or porcelain), form (plate, bowl, unidentified tableware, unidentified teaware, etc.), completion (rim, body, base, etc.), glaze type, glaze color (and for some types, transparency), sherd thickness, weight, maximum size (measured in 5mm intervals), decoration genre (hand painted blue, transfer print, etc.), location (interior, exterior, rim, body, etc.), technique (lathe incised, hand painted, etc.), color (based on a detailed Pantone-based scheme laid out in the DAACS Colorbook), stylistic element (ranging from specific [bird, plain band 06 or specific transfer print pattern] to general decorative styles [botanical, unidentified, plain band, unidentified, or unidentified]) (each of which is detailed in a series of stylistic elements manuals), and condition (use wear, burning, etc.). Coarse earthenwares require detailed information about paste color, inclusions, thickness of various completions (when relevant), and other attributes. The option for attaching images is also available.

Similar information is recorded for pipe stems. For these, material, paste color, glaze presence and color, type, completion (bowl, rim, stem, base, mouthpiece, and combinations thereof), weight and other measurements (for stems: length, exterior diameter, and bore diameter in both mm and 1/64 inch), text marks that are entered into
open fields, and decoration (limited to a handful of choices including botanical, geometric, zoomorphic, and others, along with open fields for description). As with ceramics, the option for attaching images is available.

All measurements are taken using calipers (set to the hundredth millimeter), a standardized DAACS laminated desk mat with minimum sherd size circles in millimeters, diameter projections in millimeters, electronic scales (weighing to hundredths of grams), a 10x magnification loupe or microscope (for inclusions), a flexible (metric) tape, and other prescribed systems as outlined in DAACS manuals and taught during training.

4.3 Statistical Analyses

Quantitative reasoning, specifically statistical analysis, is central to archaeology because it reveals the patterns within groups of data. However because these patterns are rarely clear-cut they require interpretations; these interpretations are the bases on which our understandings of the past are founded (Shennan 1997:2-3). The quantitative variables involved in my analysis included measuring thickness with calipers, measuring weights with scales, and various other data sources (as mentioned above) all of which must be entered into some kind of file, table, or database (such as DAACS) that is structured specifically for quantitative analysis (Shennan 1997:6-7).

The analyses I performed for Silver Bluff were based on the model provided by DAACS, which were developed to align with the structure of the DAACS database. The database is composed of two hundred tables, which contain project, context, and artifact information. Each table includes field names, authority terms, and basic schematic
relationships as illustrated in Figure 4.1. These tables are available through the DAACS website. The majority of the Silver Bluff assemblage was cataloged prior to the website going live. At that time the database was accessible only to a limited number of people (including partners and students of the DAACS Research Consortium, the mode through which I gained access and the basis on which Silver Bluff joined the data pool) via an open-source PostgreSQL database over the Internet using Ruby-on-Rails (an open source, standardized website database framework) (DAACS 2015b). However, the website went live during the cataloging process and the data from Silver Bluff is now accessible to the public.

Seriation

The first part of my quantitative analysis was producing a two-part seriation-based chronology for the information I had cataloged into the database. Seriation is the process of putting items in a series or order based on their intrinsic properties, the most interesting of which for archaeological study is chronology (Shennan 1997:341). This first part of my seriation study is based on Mean Ceramic Dates (MCD) among sites' contexts; the second is based on pipe stem diameters.

Correspondence Analysis

Once I completed the seriation of Silver Bluff, I ran correspondence analysis, a type of multivariate statistics that attempts to understand the nature of the link between the archaeological record and interpretations in terms of human culture and history (Madsen 1988:7). Correspondence analysis is a means of establishing seriation (including, but not limited to chronological seriation) by shuffling the order of
Figure 4.1. DAACS database Project, Context, Context Sample, Generate Artifact ID and artifact group tables and their relationships to one another.
assemblages in the similarity matrix with the aim of grouping the highest similarities along the principal diagonal, thus producing a sequence (Shennan 1997:342). The two-part seriation I created was based on that used by DAACS staff in keeping with their aim to increase comparability among sites within the database.

The "middle range approach" of correspondence analysis is superior to inductive statistics (estimation methods) in that it uses deductive, descriptive statistics to graphically and arithmetically describe individual variables to multivariate data analyses (Madsen 1988:9). In other words, multivariate statistics do not presume unknown distributional qualities of archaeological materials that are unknown; rather, it provides a means of interpreting counts of types (abundance) and presence/absence (incidence) and removes the effects of differential assemblage size (Shennan 1997:308). Hence, in correspondence analysis archaeological assemblages are not identified as samples of some whole background unit (the presumption that an assemblage is a real unit, rather than a construction). Instead, each find is considered a stand-alone event with its own meaning rather than a part of a whole. Each individual variable as well as the relationships among and between them are analyzed.

Correspondence analysis is an orthogonal regression applied to a point scatter (or cloud) in a multivariate metric space (Madsen 1988:11, Shennan 1997:318). That is, it is used (in conjunction with software, in this case R) to create an axis through a scattered cloud of points. Each axis represents a different variable (such as time or space) and each point represents an instance (in this case, a context). (Note while multiple dimensions can be included arithmetically, only two can be depicted graphically due to the reality of printing constraints).
Variable scatters are scaled along an orthogonal regression line. This means that the origo (or mutual mean of the variables) is set at zero. The line represents the maximum variation in a single dimension in a scatter (Madsen 1988). A second line is established perpendicular to the origo (Madsen 1988). The scatter is rotated such that its maximum (or center) is set on 0,0.

Correspondence analysis allows for simultaneous R and Q mode techniques. This means that the interrelations between variables (R) as well as the interrelations of units (Q) are analyzed (Madsen 1988:14). This technique provides an observable depiction of break points for variable tendencies in minimized clustering. Simply put, tight clusters are more meaningful than loose clusters.

*MCD*

MCD is a weighted average (type frequency) of the manufacturing date midpoints for historical ceramic types within an assemblage (DAACS 2015c). More sherds of a given type have greater influence in the average as compared to fewer sherds, which are weighed less heavily. Manufacturing midpoint estimates are computed from ware types manufacturing beginning and ending dates taken from ceramics industry documentary evidence (DAACS 2015c).

Although five is DAACS' standard minimum ware type sherd number count required to calculate a MCD, I found that Silver Bluff contexts with fewer than ten sherds became outliers and decided to exclude them from the seriation based on that behavior. (For ware types, however, I maintained the DAACS standard and only types with fewer than five sherds were excluded from analyses).
The initial step in developing site seriation was the creation of a Harris Matrix. A Harris Matrix summarizes stratigraphic relationships among excavated contexts and groups of contexts (DAACS 2015d). To create the Harris Matrix I identified stratigraphic groups (defined as groups of contexts that field records indicate were part of a single stratigraphic layer, lithostratigraphic unit, or deposit (personal communication Leslie Cooper 2015) and assigned them to Stratigraphic Groups (SGs) in the database (however, not all contexts have Stratigraphic Group assignments because they are not stratigraphically or depositionally related to other contexts). Each SG has an "SG" prefix preceding the group number.

I assigned ten SGs at Silver Bluff: SG01 through SG10. The numbers were assigned beginning with features moving down the site's blocks and quadrats north to south, then to those levels that seal the features (A and B within each unit), identified as plowzone as seen in Figure 4.2. (Note, the block naming convention was my creation and exists solely for explanatory purposes. It does not relate to any excavational work or database schema.)

(Notes: The map indicates that the palisade is much wider in Block A than in Block B. This is because the palisade makes a turn in Block A, the boundaries of which were not always clearly identifiable to the excavators, so for some units in this block the entire level was considered as feature fill. In other units [where the palisade is more narrow] the feature was readily identifiable and could, thus, be separated from general fill. The palisade was, likely, relatively uniform in width.)
Figure 4.2. Silver Bluff Excavation Blocks One (top), Two (middle), and Three (bottom).
In addition, the feature labeled as a well (F28) has a very large diameter. Again, the boundaries of the feature were not always obvious to excavators and when it became apparent that it was not part of the palisade, they abandoned it. They were never able to fully investigate the feature due to time constraints, but it was their decision to refer to the feature as a well (personal communication Tammy Forehand Herron).

Although the DAACS convention is to number groups from the upper strata down, I decided to number them from the oldest to the most recent (bottom up) because it better suits the stratigraphical notion of depositional events occurring through time as seen in Figure 4.3. (In other words, deeper strata are temporally earlier and a lower number is sequentially earlier than a higher number.) The layer intruded by the

Figure 4.3. The Harris Matrix for Silver Bluff shows the depositional relationships among stratigraphic groups and other independent strata and features.
features (C in each unit) are not grouped stratigraphically because no one depositional event links them. Further, I felt grouping them based on temporality made the Harris Matrix more difficult to interpret.

SG01 identifies the section of F19 (palisade trench) within the northernmost block of the excavation units (which includes units 330, 332, 333, 334, 335 and 341), hereafter referred to as Block One.

SG02 was assigned to the same feature (F19) within the middle excavation block (including units 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, and 329), hereafter referred to as Block Two. The feature was split because the two sections are not contiguous (although they are assumed to be linked through an unexcavated section).

SG03 refers to F18 (the brick architectural feature) contained within Block Two.

SG04 was assigned to F28 (a large deposit identified as a possible well during excavation), which resides in Block Three, the southernmost of the three excavation blocks.

Excavators identified a plowzone approximately twenty centimeters deep (split into two arbitrary ten centimeter levels) beginning at the ground surface. This zone is consistent between the three excavation blocks. I assigned the plowzone to six separate SGs. Although it would have been possible to assign the groups in other ways (such as split among three groups [one for each block] or to two groups [arbitrary levels A and B] or one overall plowzone group), I determined that six groups provides the best sense of clarity and makes a clean Harris Matrix while still allowing for the possibility that important differences exist among blocks and levels.
SG05 is the first of the six Stratigraphic Groups identified as plowzone. It refers to level B (the lower of the two arbitrary plowzone levels identified during excavation) in Block One.

SG06 is also level B, however it refers only to level B within Block Two.

SG07 was assigned to level B within Block Three.

SG08 is the first in a series of three SGs assigned to the uppermost level (A) of plowzone that exists in Block One.

SG09 is plowzone level A in Block Two.

SG10, the final SG, is plowzone level A in Block Three.

Once stratigraphic groups were established, I ran Harrix Matrix code through R (open-source statistical software) using coding provided to me by Fraser Neiman. The Harris Matrix summarizes stratigraphic relationships among the stratigraphic groups into a diagram as seen in Figure 4.3 above. The diagram is drawn with ArchEd (software created specifically for drawing Harris Matrices in archaeology).

The Harris Matrix shows the ten Stratigraphic Groups I created and their relationship to the other contexts within the site. The six levels represent depositional events temporally, with the recent most at the top and the oldest at the bottom. Each of the three blocks is separate and can be seen on the Harris Matrix as read left to right (Figure 4.3). Block Three as seen on the right-hand side of the Harris Matrix is notable for its lack of relation to the other two blocks (which appear separately, but are actually linked through the presumably continuous F19, the palisade), except through the more recent plowing episode(s). Block Three initially appeared to predate F19. As seen in Figure 4.2, the palisade skirts F28 (and all of Block Three) indicating that it existed prior
to the palisade's construction. However, only one phase has been identified for Silver Bluff based on MCD and the pipe bore seriation did not suggest that Block Three is any earlier than the other two blocks. As such, the entire cataloged assemblage represents one occupational period dating to approximately 1731 (DAACS 2015a).

This date was obtained from the DAACS database, which provides two MCD queries. The first query provides MCD for a selected aggregation level; the second provides ware type frequencies. Although DAACS typically uses phases as units for MCD, I established contexts as the relevant units for Silver Bluff MCD queries based on the lack of temporal phasing. The MCD for each stratigraphic group is shown in Table 4.1.

In addition to the traditional MCD technique described above, DAACS utilizes Blue MCD, or Best Linear Unbiased Estimator Mean Ceramic Dates, a variation on the ware type frequency weighting scheme in which less weight is given to ware types with particularly long spans of manufacture (Neiman and Smith 2005). MCD and Blue MCD for Silver Bluff as a whole are 1731 and 1758, respectively. (The latter date is, in this case, a better estimate.)

Unsurprisingly, SG01 and SG02 have roughly equivalent MCD's and the same Blue MCD. This makes sense because they are part of the same deposit (F19). These dates (1726 and 1730) are roughly same period (within a decade) as the plowzone level artifacts from Blocks One and Two. However F19's Blue MCDs indicate the feature is about a decade (ten to thirteen years) earlier than that the plowzone contexts. In contrast, F18, the brick architectural feature, seems to be contemporaneous with the plowzone artifacts.
Table 4.1 Silver Bluff Stratigraphic Groups MCDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>DAACS Stratigraphic Group</th>
<th>MCD</th>
<th>Blue MCD</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG01</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG02</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG03</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG04</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG05</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG06</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG07</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG08</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG09</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bluff</td>
<td>SG10</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, analysis of SG04 is rather surprising. My initial hypothesis of F28 (the well) being earlier than the rest of the site's contexts is not reflected in its MCD. In fact, both its MCD and Blue MCD show it to be roughly contemporaneous with the rest of the site (however, as noted previously, it was never fully excavated). Again, though contrary to my initial idea, seriation analyses indicate that the Silver Bluff collection cataloged into DAACS represents one generally contemporaneous assemblage.
Pipe Bore Diameter

I used pipe bore diameters as an independent means of establishing seriation for Silver Bluff. Pipe bore hole diameters work for identifying intrasite seriation because the diameter of the bore of clay pipes changes directionally with time in a way that may be consistently calibrated with date, so that they can be independently dated themselves and also be used to date the contexts in which they are found (Shennan 1997:345). For pipe stems (unlike MCD), seriation is a relatively simple case involving only a single variable (Shennan 1997:345).

Using R coding, once again provided by Fraser Neiman, I successfully established a chronological seriation based on pipe bore diameters for Silver Bluff. I initially ran the analysis on the stratigraphic groups outlined above as I had for MCD; however, no positive results came out of that effort. I then ran SES (Social-Ecological Systems, used for analyzing dynamic bio-geo-physical units that change in response to internal and/or external pressures [Schlüter et al. 2014]) on all the site's features, but most of these had too few pipe stems to provide seriation and analysis of feature groups provided too few points to create a scatter plot cloud. Finally, I ran analysis on each context listed individually along with the feature groups. This last effort did provide a positive result.

The pipe bore stem measurement scatter plot (Figure 4.4), shows a roughly linear point cloud indicating a steady decrease in pipe stem bore diameter through time, an established dating mechanism in historical archaeology (Binford 1961, Harrington 1954). (Not all scatters are linear, they can also be curvilinear [non-linear monotonic] and non-
monotonic ["U" or "V" shaped] indicating relationships that either change in quantity throughout the range with distance while maintaining one direction or change both in quantity and direction, respectively [Shennan 1997:129-130]). I split the linear pipe bore stem cloud into three parts (1.8mm, 1.9mm, and 2.0mm, the most prevalent three sizes at Silver Bluff), assigned colors to each segment, and then mapped them onto each quadrat and feature on the Harris Matrix as well as onto a map of each context to visually support the chronological change.

Figure 4.4. A linear point cloud indicating a steady decrease in pipe stem bore diameter size through dimension one (time).

Using Binford's (1961) formula and converting the metric measurement to English standard (1932.85-(38.26 x bore mean x .0393701 x 64)) I was able to establish
dates approximating site occupation between 1741 and 1759. This representation indicated that no 1.8mm stems existed in any of the contexts in level C. In addition, 2.0mm stems existed in three units in that level, while there were only two contexts in level B with 2.0mm stems, and only one context in level A with that size stem. This suggests that pipe stems with 2.0mm bore diameters decreased in prevalence (using discard as a proxy) as time progressed.

The seriation produced suggested that the lower level (C) and feature groups one, two, and three, are earlier than the upper two (plowzone) levels (A and B). While this chronology seems obvious, MCD seriation did not provide such information, so it is useful in that it evidences plowing events occurred only after the eighteenth century occupation of Silver Bluff. Still, C, the lowest level of the site, reflects only one occupational event. As such the entire Silver Bluff assemblage may be understood as a single unit of comparison.

4.4 Comparison of Sites' Abundance Indices

In this section, I describe how I calculated abundance indices for the ceramics from Silver Bluff and the four other South Carolina plantation sites (Yaughan I, Yaughan II, Curriboo, and Middleburg) assemblages to provide evidence of similarities and differences in eighteenth century Backcountry and Lowcountry consumption patterns. These patterns indicate that Silver Bluff abounded with ceramic diversity and that the inhabitants of Silver Bluff (and, perhaps, by extrapolation, the South Carolina Backcountry because of the increased access to goods that trading posts like Galphin's may have afforded them) lived in a socioeconomically cosmopolitan world, a world that
included local, regional, and large-scale exchange, and vast opportunity for choice. These choices would have related to a number of things, including utility and functionality of ware types for particular tasks, as well as intangible social expressions such as status, gentility, and group membership.

To support my hypothesis about Backcountry cosmopolitanism, I calculated abundance indices (estimates of discard rates) as a proxy for consumption. The groundwork for calculating these rates involved creating a Harris Matrix of Silver Bluff's stratigraphic contexts, running a query in DAACS for Silver Bluff's Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) (DAACS 2015a), and completing correspondence analysis on the site's assemblage in order to establish chronological seriation.

Abundance indices estimate discard rates relative to an established baseline discard rate (Galle et al. 2015). The baseline rate is presumed to be stable or change in a predictable way. Based on work by Galle (2006), I calculated the indices using wine bottle glass as an effective baseline measure for the eighteenth century using the following formula: (waretype/(waretype + wine bottle glass sherd count). The indices were then plotted against time (in this case MCD.) Plots were then created for each ware type and compared among sites. The results of this analysis are discussed in the next chapter.

4.5 Limitations

Any statistical interpretation, including multivariate statistics, relies heavily on the descriptions of the archaeological record provided by the archaeologist. In some cases, it may be that the data are contemporaneous and that seriation does not, in fact, exist. It is also possible that failure to obtain seriation may be the fault of the
archaeologist, not the archaeological record or the statistical methodology (Madsen 1988:25). Two methods of ensuring a study's soundness are replicability and independent lines of study, each of which is proven in my study.

Further, although time is vital to the concept of typologies and human behavioral changes, it is not a given as one of the dimensions provided by correspondence analysis; time sequence seriations must be proven. As discussed, Silver Bluff does not have a proven time sequence seriation. Thus, no lines may be fit to a "V" or "U" shaped scatter that would be evidenced by a temporal dimension. Instead, the site's ceramic seriation provides a non-linear scatter as seen in Figure 4.5.

To counteract the non-linearity of the ceramic seriation's point cloud, I seriated Silver Bluff's pipe bore stem diameters. This analysis suggested that the only chronological seriation is between the site's plow zone and non-plow zone levels. This interpretation ignores any potential errors with Binford's improvements upon Harrington's pipe bore diameter chronology, Neiman's coding, and my applications of these.

In addition, correspondence analysis presumes a strict sequence of deposition to which real life does not adhere. In settlement occupation phases in particular, there may be time lags among settlements (Shennan 1997:342). This would certainly have been the case among my study sites; however, as I did not run correspondence analysis for intersite comparisons, the only applicable limitation of this type for my study is within Silver Bluff itself. As noted, there is no apparent chronological seriation within the site, and a single occupational phase is suggested. Yet, even this situation encompasses time
Figure 4.5. This scatter plot does not fall into a linear pattern indicating no ceramics-based seriation.

lags as depositions occur in fits and starts over a period of time rather than steadily through time. Both physical and temporal distances provide these depositional stream gaps, which correspondence analysis ignores. Regarding the intersite comparison based on abundance indices, the possible limitations include presuming that constant change over time in South Carolina's wine bottle glass acts as an appropriate and reliable base line for ceramic change through time.
At a basic level, equipment errors provide another limitation. The electronic equipment I used (particularly the scale) often required zeroing out, suggesting that their errors in measurement increased with each subsequent use until they were manually recalibrated. However, because measurements are taken at the hundredth degree, this fluctuation likely had a very minor impact.

On a higher theoretical level, my reliance upon DAACS protocol ignores contrasting methodologies and typologies. Yet, because DAACS is founded on such rigorous training and is a collaborative effort, I believe the DAACS-bias in my study also has minimal effects.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter I analyze the artifact assemblage from Silver Bluff and compare my findings with the collections from Yaughan I, Yaughan II, Curriboo, and Middleburg plantations. Using the methodology outlined in Chapter 4, I find great diversity among ceramic ware types at Silver Bluff and note the assorted origins of these types, supporting my hypothesis of Backcountry participation in trade networks (both regional and trans-Atlantic) alongside localized production.

Taking the results of the seriation I found based on pipe stem bore chronology, I use the ceramic assemblage from Silver Bluff as a single unit and compare it with the ceramic assemblages from the four other South Carolina plantation sites in DAACS using abundance indices. I also explore a previous study (Joy et al. 2015) of Silver Bluff and contemporaneous South Carolina plantation sites. Both sets of analyses show that Silver Bluff not only had a greater variety of ceramic ware types than the other sites, but that this diversity was present at an earlier date in the "backward frontier" than in at least some spaces in the "more civilized" Lowcountry.

These findings are used to support the notions that the inhabitants of Silver Bluff (and by extrapolation, the South Carolina Backcountry) lived in a socioeconomically cosmopolitan world, a world that included local, regional, and large-scale exchange, and vast opportunity for choice. These choices would have related to a number of things,
including utility and functionality of ware types for particular tasks, as well as intangible social expressions such as status, gentility, and group membership. For example, a porcelain teacup is not only useful for drinking tea with, but also for demonstrating to observers that the drinker is of the tea drinking social group, a group characterized as having refinement, leisure time, and a degree of affluence.

5.1 The Silver Bluff Assemblage

Although this study focuses primarily on Silver Bluff's ceramic assemblage, my analyses also rely upon other artifact groups. For example, imported ball clay/kaolin pipe stem fragments were used in determining the site's chronology. In addition, wine bottle glass sherds are used as a baseline measure for calculating ceramic abundance indices (measures of discard described below) at Silver Bluff as well as each of the other four plantation sites to which I compare it.

Many other noteworthy artifacts exist at Silver Bluff including faunal material, glass sherds that are not from wine bottles, beads, buckles, buttons, tobacco pipe bowl fragments, utensils, and a huge variety of "general artifacts." "General artifacts" is a catch-all group comprising architectural remains like brick, mortar, daub, and nails along with unidentifiable metal fragments, objects made of stone (including both prehistoric artifacts such as projectile points, flakes, and knives, as well as historic artifacts such as gunflints), lead shot, glass that did not come from a vessel, all types of hardware, artifacts referred to elsewhere (South 1977) as "personal items" such as brushes, fobs, and mirrors as well as "clothing group" related items not accounted for elsewhere such as thimbles,
straight pins, hook and eye fasteners, along with "activities group" items like tools, toys, and ethnobotanicals like seeds.

5.2 COMPARISON OF ABUNDANCE INDICES

In this section, I describe how I used abundance indices (a method of descriptive statistical analysis) to show changes in consumption patterns among eighteenth and nineteenth century South Carolina plantation sites. To evaluate my hypothesis of colonial Backcountry cosmopolitanism, I calculated abundance indices (estimates of discard rates) as a proxy for consumption. The groundwork for calculating these rates involved creating a Harris Matrix of Silver Bluff's stratigraphic contexts and running a query in DAACS for Silver Bluff's Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) (DAACS 2015a) as described in the previous chapter.

Abundance indices estimate discard rates relative to an established baseline discard rate (Galle 2004, 2006, Galle et al. 2015). Based on work by Galle (2006), I calculated the indices using wine bottle glass as a baseline measure for the eighteenth century. Abundance indices were calculated using the following formula:

\[
\frac{\text{waretype}}{\text{waretype} + \text{wine bottle glass sherd count}}
\]

Unlike relative frequencies, which measure discard rates based on the assumption that the discard rate of the numerator artifact class is independent of the discard rates for all of the artifact classes, which make up the denominator (the total sample), abundance indices utilize a single artifact class for the denominator value. A useful denominator class (wine bottle glass, in this case) need remain relatively constant across sites or vary predictably over time in order to provide a high correlation (defined by Galle [2010] as a
vector angle greater than 90 degrees within the context of principal component analysis, a method not used here) between abundance index and discard rates (Galle 2004, 2010). This baseline rate is presumed to be stable or to change in a predictable way.

Although Galle (2004, 2006, et al. 2010) builds her indices upon a denominator based on similar cross-site discard rates, I cannot identify a cross-site stable category for my comparative sites because I have no documentation on how any particular artifact class came to be present on any of the five comparison sites. Rather, I assume that both ceramics and wine bottle would have been regularly provisioned to enslaved peoples (or acquired, in the case of Silver Bluff.) (Although it is possible that provisioned rations may have been supplemented through alternative modes of access.) While slave habitations and slave villages might be expected to have fewer wine glass bottles than other habitation and structure types (and, hence, fewer sherds in their archaeological assemblages), the same may also be said of other artifact groups, including ceramics. Hence, I presume both ceramics and glass are consistently acquired on each site through time producing a correlation between their discard rates within sites. However, these discard rates vary among sites. It is this intra-site variation in discard that I use abundance indices to measure.

Once calculated, the indices were then plotted against time, in this case MCD. Although the site-wide MCDs for the five sites vary from 1731 (or Blue MCD:1758) to 1786, and sample sizes vary from 34 to 1,629, the use of abundance indices in estimating rates of discard make these variations irrelevant (due to the intrasite independence created by the use of site specific calculations). I supposed that discard rates would likely be affected by historical events such as the Consumer Revolution (such that later sites would
have higher rates of discard related to their possession of more objects in general due to the decrease in cost associated with mass production), as well as site functionality and inhabitant choice.

Finally, I created plots for each ware type and compared them among sites. I charted the ware types for each site, but removed types with fewer than ten sherds in order to make the charts comprehensible. Notice the disparity in sample size (Figure 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5) requiring three different scales to enable visual comparison. Also, note that only two ware types are present at all sites: Creamware and North Midlands/Staffordshire Slipware. (Although Pearlware is also present at each site, the number of sherds in the Silver Bluff assemblage is below the ten sherd minimum count requirement I established for my analyses.) My explanation for the prevalence of Creamware and North Midlands/Staffordshire Slipware is the popularity (related to relative low cost and high prevalence) of these types within the time period under study.

The large number of ware types at each site, and the diversity among them, produced an unwieldy number of abundance indices across sites. Thus, I selected only those ware types from each site with an abundance index greater than .1 to chart in Figure 5.6. This figure shows those wares with the highest rate of discard from each site.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF ABUNDANCE INDEX ANALYSES

Silver Bluff’s highest rates of discard are in North Midlands/Staffordshire slipware, Chinese porcelain, and white salt glaze stoneware. Most of the site's sherds were too small to identify particular forms, but I infer that they likely belonged to tableware (in the case of the slipware and stoneware) and either tableware or teaware (in
Figure 5.1. Ware types and sherd counts from Silver Bluff used to calculate MCD.
Figure 5.2. Ware types and sherd counts from Yaughan I used to calculate MCD.
Figure 5.3. Ware types and sherd counts from Yaughan II used to calculate MCD.
Figure 5.4. Ware types and sherd counts from Curriboo used to calculate MCD.
Figure 5.5. Ware types and sherd counts from Middleburg used to calculate MCD.
Figure 5.6. Scatter plot of each sites abundance indices for ware types (greater than .1) and each sites' MCD.

the case of the porcelain). Note that because Silver Bluff has few cataloged forms, I did not do any form-related analyses for any of the five sites.

Curriboo's wares with the highest rates of discard are Chinese porcelain and Staffordshire slipware indicating, again, perhaps, the presence of tablewares. This is similar to the finding for Silver Bluff in the relationship between ware type discard rates and temporality (including ceramic functionality as related to tablewares), in addition to the consideration of overall site function.

Yaughan I also has a high discard rate for Chinese porcelain. However, it also shows a sudden upsurge in the discard of pearlware, which had come into favor by the
mid to late eighteenth century (Noel Hume 1969:128-131, South 1977:212), perhaps to the detriment of Staffordshire slipware on this site.

Yaughan II has a high discard rate for Westerwald/Rhenish, a German stoneware often used for utilitarian purposes. Although Silver Bluff also had a sizable amount of Westerwald, it is not in the top three wares discarded there as it is at Yaughan II. Although Yaughan II's habitation period is most similar to Silver Bluff's, these analyses and the overall history and function of the site's excavated areas, suggest that their consumption patterns are quite different.

Middleburg's highest discard rates are found in creamware, Staffordshire slipware, and redware. It is interesting that Staffordshire slipware makes a reappearance here, as it is not present at either Yaughan site. This may be related to a lack of access to Staffordshire among the residents of Yaughan as compared to that at Middleburg or factors such as site function, resident behavior, and/or choice.

I hypothesize that it is functional/behavioral as there are no wares that reflect table use in either of the Yaughan sites. Specifically, the fact that Middleburg's assemblage comes not only from slave cabins, but also included multiple other types of structures, including the main house, results in a larger, more varied assemblage. The main house would have had both tables (used for dining) and storage areas for various types of wares, including tablewares. The slave habitations at Yaughan, in contrast, may not have had tables on which to use tablewares or the dining context in which they would have been used. (Slave dining experiences are suggested to have been communal, single pot and multi-bowled events, which utilized outdoor fire pits [Ferguson 1992] whereas big house dining involved being served using luxurious imported goods, particularly in
the company of guests [Ferguson 1992, Groover 1994], which would not have been present in slave habitations.)

Similarly, the presence of redware at Middleburg suggests either a utilitarian or table-use purpose and functionality. Middleburg is also the only site with a high rate of creamware discard. Again, this may be related to the site's function as a slave village in addition to including the main house and other domestic structures. By 1785 creamware had fallen out of favor and, as such, is may have been more accessible to enslaved peoples.

Middleburg's multifunctionality means that it served a large number of purposes and engaged a larger number of people than the other sites. This fact may account for Middleburg's wide variety of consumed wares in that its inhabitants would have needed (and, perhaps, desired) and selected more types of wares. The enslaved residents would have used some of these wares themselves and some to serve the residents and guests of the big house. Yaughan and Curriboo's slave habitation-centered assemblages reflect dining styles that do not include big house-style conspicuous consumption and, thus, consist of fewer ware types than either Middleburg or Silver Bluff.

5.4 DISCUSSION OF WARES NOT INCLUDED IN MCD

In this section I discuss wares that were present at each site, but could not be included in abundance indices because they are not included in MCD calculations. These wares are not mass-produced and/or imported en masse as the European wares are. As such, they do not appear in contexts of conspicuous consumption, which reflect the desire
to appear refined. Rather, they are part of the local production and/or regional trade networks that align with ideas of subsistence and production-based autonomy.

*Colonoware*

One ware present on each of the five sites that is not used in determining MCD is colonoware (DAACS 2015d). I have charted the presence of colonoware in Figure 5.7 as a cross-sites comparative using sherd count to assemblage ratios in order to demonstrate its prevalence. The variation in sherd numbers across sites (colonoware comprises the following rounded percentages of each assemblage: Yaughan I, 90%; Yaughan II, 63%; Curriboo, 89%; Middleburg, 73% and Silver Bluff, 31%) surely reflects functional and/or choice related differences in consumption, again indicating the disparities among the five sites.

As noted above, enslaved people typically relied primarily upon colonoware for their own dining needs (although it may also have been used to serve the big house [Ferguson 1992].) The small amount of colonoware compared to other ware types at Silver Bluff relative to the other sites may be related to the assemblage's lack of slave habitation component. (It is likely that Silver Bluff did have habitations for the enslaved; however, these have not been investigated). The difference in site types is quite clear when colonoware prevalence is taken into account; but this difference that was identified early in the study and assemblage differences related to that disparity come as no surprise.

In addition, because they lived on trading post/plantation site, Silver Bluff's residents would likely have had greater access to imported wares than would the residents
of the Yaughan, Curriboo, and Middleburg. Hence, they would have had less cause to make or acquire colonoware than would residents of the other sites. Moreover, there is evidence that colonoware was produced at Yaughan and Curriboo (Wheaton and Garrow 1985), while no such evidence has been found for Silver Bluff. This fact alone could account for the disparity in ware type ratios. Still, the constancy of colonoware across sites reflects the inclusion of local production in both Backcountry and Lowcountry life.

Figure 5.7. Plot highlighting prevalence of colonoware at each of the five sites contrasted with all other ware types. (Note the ratio between colonoware and other wares at Silver Bluff is the inverse of those at the other sites.)
Unidentified Coarse Earthenwares

Another ware type found on each site is unidentified coarse earthenware. These wares do not have tightly defined dates of manufacture, so are not included in MCD and, hence, were not included in abundance indices. Importantly, these wares can be of local, regional or trans-Atlantic (primarily English) production (Adams 2000:30-32, Bloch 2015, Elliott and Elliott 1991). Thus, at present this ware type cannot tell us much about production and exchange at Silver Bluff (or in the Carolina colony) aside from the fact that it is complex. Chemical analyses may be able to better identify the clay sources for these wares and from that we could extrapolate their place of manufacture and, perhaps, trace their journeys to the site.

For example, it is documented that pottery was produced in Bethany (located near New Ebenezer and the mouth of the Savannah River) in the 1760s (Adams 2000). A potter named Andrew Duche supplied New Ebenezer with earthenwares in the 1730s and wares that may be attributed to him have been found in Saxe Gotha (near present day Columbia, SC) (Adams 2000). While John Landrum's renowned Edgefield pottery was not established until 1810 (believed to be the first stoneware pottery in the district) (Castille et al. 1988), it is not outside the realm of possibility that a Backcountry earthenware potter existed in the prior century.

At present, however, I am satisfied with the idea that these could be of local (although no kilns have been found on the site to date and I know of none in the region during the relevant time period), regional and long-distance production, suggesting, again, that exchange occurred in both the Backcountry and Lowcountry, as well as
throughout the colonies and across the Atlantic. Because of this production identification quagmire, unidentified coarse earthenwares are not included in MCD.

The ware types that are included in MCD are primarily of European manufacture. Each site contained these types of wares. However, the particular types of wares varied through time, as well as site-specific utility. Silver Bluff stands out by being the only site with highest discard of porcelain, Staffordshire slipware, and white salt glazed stoneware, indicating prevalence of tea and tablewares at a level of ware type diversity not seen in the other sites. This, alongside the presence of the local and regional ware types, indicates diversified consumption at Silver Bluff that is unique among the South Carolina plantation sites in this study.

The inhabitants of Silver Bluff engaged in local production of ceramic ware as expressed by the presence of colonoware, regional exchange as suggested by the presence of unidentified coarse earthenwares (likely of regional and or trans-Atlantic production, although possibly of local production), and long-distance trade as reflected in imported wares of European and Chinese manufacture. Further, the variety of ware types suggests teawares, tablewares, and utilitarian wares were used in daily Backcountry life. This diversity in consumed ceramic wares suggests that Backcountry inhabitants had access to a range of goods and, thus, the opportunity for making choices, both economic and social.

5.5 Conclusions

The five-site comparison I make in this thesis is imperfect because of the way in which the DAACS South Carolina plantation sites (excluding Silver Bluff) are skewed towards slave habitations. In 2014-2015 Charles Cobb, Tammy Forehand Herron, and I
conducted a study (unpublished, presented at the 2015 Society for Historical Archaeology conference) of Silver Bluff’s material diversity. The primary emphasis of this study was to compare a handful of other South Carolina plantations that were temporally similar to Silver Bluff in order to investigate previous claims (Groover 1994) of Silver Bluff’s material diversity. The first of the comparative sites was Howell Plantation, established by Thomas Howell circa 1740 and inhabited until 1775 (Groover 1994). Unlike Galphin who was primarily a trader (although by the end of his life he was a planter) (Forehand et al. 2004), Thomas Howell was primarily involved in the cattle raising. Howell also held the rights to two roads and a ferry, and had some involvement in the deerskin trade (Groover 1994, 2014).

The second plantation compared was Yauhannah, located near present-day Georgetown. Although it is not a Backcountry plantation, it is useful as a comparative because when it was founded in the eighteenth century, it was on the northern margin of the nucleus of English settlements (Adams 2006). In other words, although Yauhannah is located in the geographic Lowcountry, it may still be considered a frontier site.

The final comparison site was Limerick plantation, an archetypal Lowcountry plantation built on the standard two-crop economy of indigo and rice (Lees 1980). These sites were selected for their contemporaneity, though we also felt that their geographic dispersal provided a sense of balance to our sample. We used diversity measures and rarefaction (a re-sampling procedure utilized by Gotelli and Golwell [2001]) to get a comparative richness among the sites without being distracted by the assemblage's widely varying sizes.
The results of this study revealed a rich material culture for Silver Bluff. Of the four sites, it was the only one that fell above the 95% confidence interval for expected richness. Though tied with Lowcountry Limerick for number of ceramic wares present, Silver Bluff’s assemblage was found to be much richer than Limerick’s. We believed this unique quality can be attributed to the trading post functions of the locality. Goods available for the purpose of trade provide a possible explanation for diversity that is not found at non-trading post sites. The high number of ware types at the site could also indicate that Galphin’s rise in status and multitude of social connections allowed him to acquire a greater variety of goods than other planters.

Both of these findings may be extrapolated to the intra-DAACS comparison that is the primary focus of this thesis. My thesis analyses suggest that Silver Bluff's residents had more access than those at Yaughan, Curriboo, and Middleburg, which as discussed is likely due to their status as either primarily free (for Silver Bluff) or primarily enslaved (for Yaughan and Curriboo). Middleburg, seemingly, lies somewhere in the middle, which makes sense based on the site's mixed structural component (including both slave habitations and the main house, etc.) Accordingly, Silver Bluff had greater ware type diversity than Middleburg.

In the Joy, Cobb, and Forehand Herron (2015) study we found that even when compared with site assemblages that are not comprised of slave-based habitations, the apparent access provided by the trading post function of the Silver Bluff site allowed for a greater diversity of goods. These goods would have been obtained by the site's inhabitants and others (including indigenous peoples and settlers) who traded there. The trading post, therefore, enabled a diverse group of people access to a wider array of items.
than they might otherwise have had, as well as the opportunity to interact with one another, making it a social hub as well as a place to acquire objects.

Thus, Silver Bluff’s role as an economic and social crossroads had a major impact on consumption patterns at the site. Although it seems certain that the reasons for Silver Bluff's relative outstanding diversity include site functionality (Silver Bluff's assemblage is from a trading post and plantation, rather than a slave-habitation-centered site), it is also clear that Silver Bluff's inhabitants engaged in a variety of activities, including those associated with subsistence as well as those characterized as refined. The goods associated with these activities (such as conspicuous consumption of imported luxury ceramics in big house dining scenarios as well as more utilitarian wares, of local or regional production used in more private contexts) could be obtained at the trading post, making it pivotal to at least a portion of the Backcountry's cosmopolitanism.

The inverse lack of goods on the comparison sites does not indicate incivility or lack of social mores, however. Rather, it is related to both diminished access and the ability (and/or desire) to participate in social displays. In other words, neither the colonial South Carolina Backcountry nor the Lowcountry was lacking in "civility." Silver Bluff simply had more avenues of access and the power to participate in more diverse trade and social mores, such that its inhabitants possessed the many facets that comprise cosmopolitanism.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

In this thesis I analyzed a rich material assemblage from an eighteenth century Carolina Backcountry site to prove that the colonial frontier was not socially or economically stifled, but was a cosmopolitan space in an interconnected Atlantic world.

6.1 SETTING THE COSMOPOLITAN COLONIAL SCENE

I began this thesis by situating the historical background of eighteenth century trading post and plantation Silver Bluff and considered the complex role that the colonial frontier played in the development of Carolina. I also outlined the way in which the Backcountry and Lowcountry were interrelated agents in a multifaceted colonial endeavor (including settlement and establishment of reliable and profitable ventures), rather than being isolates of modernity and stagnation (respectively) or nodes of progress and anti-progress on an overarching imperial wheel.

As in many colonial settings, Carolinian adaptation and survival within local context was key and imperial agendas were chiefly structural. Though England’s vision for the Carolina economy was a profitable agricultural plantation model, plantation agriculture did not initially flourish in Carolina as it had in the Caribbean (Coclanis 2005, Gallay 2002, Nyman 2011, Ramsey 2002). Rather, the indigenous slave and deerskin trades grew alongside agricultural endeavors. The resultant diversified economy required
indigenous partners (Barker 2001, Stern 2013) in a way that plantation slave labor did not. However, planters soon gained a foothold through the help of governmental credit schema and the economy shifted from mercantilism- to plantation-based. As a result, colonial borders shifted and enslaved labor from the trans-Atlantic trade (particularly those sourced from Africa) became more easily obtained and enslaved African, rather than indigenous people or a combination of the two, became vital to the success of the Carolina economy.

Indigenous slavery fell out of favor for number of reasons including the influence of Naturalism's human taxonomy on social consciousness regarding the enslavability of indigenous people and the more practical consideration involving difficulty with enslaving indigenous peoples including the loss of alliance, increased conflict, and diminished populations. Consequently, reliance on indigenous groups for slave-sourcing, as well as trade more broadly, diminished (Hewitt 2001). Carolina was thus transformed through socioeconomic adaptation to changing circumstances including greater access to and dependence on trans-Atlantic trading networks. Backcountry settler George Galphin's transition from trader to planter that I described earlier serves as a localized example that mirrors this broader societal shift.

This complex action of social transformation is reflected in material culture, which is comprised of individuals' possessions. Galphin and the other inhabitants of Silver Bluff left behind a rich material legacy that reflects the cosmopolitan frontier's material culture: the foundation of my thesis. To make this claim, I first investigated the theoretical framing of frontiers.
Based on archaeological evidence, frontier areas and metropoles should not be divided on the basis of their supposed levels of civility, but should be united into a broader schema to which both urban and rural locales and inhabitants contribute. I suggested that notions of frontiers as "quaint" or simple marginalizes them and ignores their unique positions as physical and cultural borderlands upon which social and economic relations rely. (In fact, if the scale of observation is expanded, Carolina as a whole becomes England's western colonial frontier and the grandeur of Charleston is demoted to backwater, an unsettling idea for certain!) Thus, idea of the Backcountry as a frontier space inherently lesser than Charleston does not stand; however, the Backcountry did have distinctive characteristics and was a unique space. A multiscalar, Atlantic perspective provides a way of viewing the colonial world as something more than a divided Carolina.

I next explored the concept of cosmopolitanism to address the human behaviors that comprise the social and cultural character of frontiers like the Carolina Backcountry. While it is common to imagine urban centers like Charleston as cosmopolitan, my definition refers to multiplicity of cultural mores including English-style gentility along with indigenous and local traditions, folkways, and variety of social communications. Therefore, cosmopolitanism, as I explained, moves beyond socially, economically, and spatially based dichotomies that overlook the diverse communities comprised of multiple statuses, classes, ethnicities, nationalities, etc. which exist not only in cities, but also in frontiers (Armstrong and Hauser 2004).
6.2 **DEMONSTRATING COSMOPOLITANISM THROUGH MATERIAL CULTURE**

In order to support the notion of socioeconomic cosmopolitanism as an observable phenomenon, I undertook a comparison study of material culture from Silver Bluff and four Lowcountry plantation estates: Yaughan I, Yaughan II, Curriboo, and Middleburg plantations.

These sites were selected based on their inclusion in DAACS, a database that provides standardized procedures for attribute-based statistical analyses. I partnered the DAACS model with correspondence analysis and abundance indices alongside traditional MCD and pipe-bore stem dating techniques in order to compare multiple sites assemblages. (The methodology and analysis chapters [4 and 5] describe the techniques I used in detail.)

My analyses, to reiterate, were primarily an effort to engage DAACS in a comparison of South Carolina plantation's material assemblages. My thesis analyses suggest that Silver Bluff's residents had more access than those at Yaughan, Curriboo, and Middleburg, which, as discussed, is likely due to their status as either primarily free (for Silver Bluff) or primarily enslaved (for Yaughan and Curriboo). Middleburg's results lay in-between as might have been expected based on the site's mixed structural component (including slave habitations, the main house, and other domestic structures.) As a site with no excavated slave-habitation component, it is not surprising that Silver Bluff had greater ware type diversity than the other sites in my study.

Although the site assemblages I compared were not ideal on the basis of site-type (the Lowcountry site collections were primarily centered on habitations of the enslaved, whereas Silver Bluff's collection is not) and the outcome of great material diversity at
Silver Bluff as compared to the other sites seems somewhat obvious based on this difference, my finding of Backcountry richness emphasizes the fact that the Silver Bluff trading post and plantation was not a struggling wilderness, but instead was a burgeoning outpost that played an important diplomatic and economic role for the Carolina colony. Other studies (Groover 1994 and 2014, Joy et al. 2015) indicate that even when compared to sites with more similar habitations, the evidence of Backcountry material richness and diversity that reflect socioeconomic prosperity holds true.

Further, my analyses indicate that although Silver Bluff's inhabitants participated in consumption and the associated notions of gentility and refinement, so too did they produce and use traditional goods in their daily lives. Interestingly, the Lowcountry sites I compared with Silver Bluff were found to possess larger numbers of locally produced wares (likely a result of differentiated access); however, they too participated in consumption of manufactured and imported goods. The slave-based habitations of Yaughan I, Yaughan II, Curriboo, and Middleburg indicate that although enslaved peoples there relied upon local production of pottery, they also possessed "luxury goods."

Thus, although my primary intention is to illustrate the way in which the frontier was socioeconomically cosmopolitan, a tangential endeavor is to promote the enslaved peoples of Carolina as cosmopolitan as well (based on their relative material diversity in relation to their social and economic status). Even so, it remains incontrovertible that Silver Bluff's many avenues of access accrued over land- and water-based trade networks and the relationships George Galphin maintained with indigenous, European, and Euro-American groups provided the means for economic, social, and material diversity at the site.
6.3 CONCLUSION

Through a study of archaeologically recovered material culture and historical context I supported my hypothesis of eighteenth century Carolinian Backcountry cosmopolitanism. I entered the assemblage from Silver Bluff trading post and plantation into DAACS and then used other Carolina plantation sites extant in the DAACS database to compare material diversity in the Carolina Backcountry and Lowcountry. This comparison was vital for illustrating frontier socioeconomic cosmopolitanism, a concept often overlooked in attempts to understand Carolina's past (Beck 1998, Crass et al. 1999, Groover 1994). I found that like renowned entrepôt Charleston and the Lowcountry surrounding it, the Carolina Backcountry was not socially backwards and economically unsophisticated, but contained multi-vocal and fluid social identities, which are reflected in consumer choices as accessed through relations with multiscalar (regional and global) trade networks as well as localized production. Such cosmopolitanism, however, is not unique to Lowcountry entrepôt Charleston or the Carolina Backcountry, but existed throughout the eighteenth century Colonial World; a world that incorporated actors in Europe, the Americas, and Africa.
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