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ABSTRACT

In recent years historical archaeologists have employed the panoptic plantation approach to examine issues of surveillance and control at plantations. Despite new scholarship in the area of the panoptic plantation, few studies place the enslaved laborer at the center and the planter-elite on the periphery. Failure to broaden the scope of studies that focus on enslaved laborers minimizes the importance of the differences in perception, cognition, and landscape between the planter-elite and the enslaved laborers.

The aim of this study is to determine potential enslaved laborer mobility and how cognitive predictive models can aid in identifying potential locations for archaeological evidence of enslaved laborers’ rituals and/or activities within a panoptic plantation landscape. To this end, two guiding research questions are as follows: (1) To what extent did the planter-elites at the plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River create and maintain an elite ideology that structured perceptions of the plantation landscape? (2) To what extent and where did the enslaved laborers create potential pathways to avoid the perceived planter-elite panoptic plantation landscape on plantations at the East Branch of the Cooper River? In this context, this dissertation requires a multidisciplinary approach that
incorporates theories and methods from the disciplines of historical archaeology, history, cultural geography, and Geographic Information Systems.

Because of the multidisciplinary nature of this dissertation, the research questions are answered through a mixed methodology that involved the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches. The first research question is addressed primarily through the collection of historical, archaeological, and geographical documentation. The second research question is addressed through the creation of several cognitive predictive models using ArcGIS 10.5.1. The Visibility Analysis models suggest that the plantations along the East Branch of the Cooper River exhibit a panoptic plantation landscape at the regional scale. The Least Cost Analysis models suggest that the enslaved laborers created potential pathways that avoided surveillance and control from the planter-elite.

On this basis, it is suggested that historical archaeologists should consider placing the enslaved laborers at the center of their studies of panoptic plantation landscapes. Further research could be to conduct comparative regional studies of other plantation communities to identify if a panoptic plantation exists and to identify where enslaved laborer may have created potential paths.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The fall of Charleston on May 12, 1780 was the greatest victory for the British in the American Revolution and the occupation was one of Charleston’s most tumultuous periods. Before the American Revolution, Lowcountry planter-elites viewed themselves as citizens of England; however, the painful cultural break brought on by the War left the planter-elite class face-to-face with an uncertain future (Edelson, 2006:12). Tensions mounted during the post-war recovery, as the Lowcountry came to terms with their need for the British and their hatred of them.

During the Revolutionary War, many enslaved laborers took advantage of the chaos to flee with the British or simply to flee and return later. Nevertheless, the planter-elite experienced a significant reduction in the enslaved population. During two brief periods, 1790 to 1800 and 1803 to 1810, of the reopening of the transatlantic slave trade planter-elites took advantage of the trade to replenish their labor force with African slaves and to increase their wealth and status. Also, during the immediate post-war years, the planter-elites reasserted their positions by recording their property, real and chattel, with the new government. The true meaning of declaring one’s property ownership was not lost on any segment of
society; property ownership in land as well as people was central in the planter-elite ethos.

Recovering from the American Revolution was the first among several incidents that threatened the carefully subscribed social and racial hierarchy created by the planter-elite. Economic depressions, the War of 1812, and Revolutions in France and Haiti had far-reaching repercussions for both the planter-elite and enslaved laborer. As the planter-elite class worried about the notions of freedom infecting their enslaved laborers from the large numbers of French Haitian refugees and their enslaved laborers and free people of color pouring into Charleston, they failed to realize that the call for freedom would come from within in the name of a free black man named Denmark Vesey. In 1822, the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy reintroduced both insecurity and social uncertainty. In the minds of the planter-elite class, the Vesey trials reinvigorated the fear that trusted domestic enslaved laborers could conceive of questioning their master’s management by plotting to murder them. Consequently, the planter-elites struggled to maintain their power and privilege and to (re)assert their cultural authority. Therefore, the American Revolution and the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy represent definitive markers in terms of power and resistance on Lowcountry rice plantations.
This dissertation examines one community of plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River in lower Berkeley County, South Carolina following the American Revolution to the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy. In the late seventeenth century English Dissenters, French Huguenots, Irish and English Barbadians, and Africans replaced the Native American population and settled the lands along the East Branch of the Cooper River in Lower St. John’s Berkeley Parish and portions of St. Thomas and St. Denis Parishes. Moving millions of cubic feet of earth without the aid of machinery, enslaved laborers, African and African-American, transformed the Lowcountry from wetlands to productive rice fields in the late seventeenth century (Ferguson 1992). Within three generations, a close-knit kin-based community quickly became prominent and prosperous on the cultivation of rice produced by the expanding number of African and African-American enslaved laborers. During a visit to the Lowcountry in 1821, Samuel Sitgreaves described the plantations as “islands in a sea of forest” with “woods, rivers, creeks, marshes, and swamps” as geographic barriers between neighboring plantations (quote in Miles 2004:92).

**Statement of the Problem**

Settlement and plantation studies in historical archaeology need to expand beyond the plantation core when examining enslaved laborers in the context of power and resistance. Despite new scholarship that employs the
panoptic plantation approach, which focuses on the issues of surveillance and control, few studies center the enslaved laborers at the core and the planter-elite at the periphery (c.f. Bates et al. 2016; Delle 2016; Kaye 2007; Randle 2011). Failure to broaden the scope of study beyond the plantation core or to center studies on the enslaved laborers minimizes the importance of perception, cognition, and landscape between the planter-elite and enslaved laborers. A possible cause for these failures is that historical archaeologists primarily focus on the role of surveillance and control from the viewpoint of the planter-elite. This dissertation suggests that employing cognitive predictive modeling expands our understanding of the panoptic plantation landscape, particularly from the viewpoint of the enslaved laborers. As a statistical and evaluative tool, a cognitive predictive model can assist historical archaeologists in addressing archaeological questions as a precursor for potential site surveys and excavations.

**Conceptual Framework**

This dissertation examines the intersection of surveillance, control, and mobility on late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Lowcountry rice plantations from the perspective of the planter-elite and the enslaved laborers. My theoretical approach is drawn from the disciplines of geography, anthropology, and historical archaeology. Each chapter contains its own
theoretical section. This section focuses on the overarching theoretical frameworks for the dissertation, which is situated within the broad paradigm of landscape archaeology, the research field of plantation archaeology, and the framework of Michel Foucault’s Panopticon theory.

In landscape archaeology Nichole Branton states that landscapes “may be as small as a single household or garden or as large as an empire,” and “landscape approaches are concerned with spatial, not necessarily ecological or economic, relationships. While similar to settlement archaeology and ecological archaeology, landscape approaches model places and spaces as dynamic participants in past behavior, not merely setting (affecting human action), or artifact (affected by human action)” (2009:51-65; emphasis added). This dissertation explores how the planter-elites manipulated their plantation landscape for surveillance and how the enslaved laborers interacted with the manipulated landscape for mobility to avoid surveillance.

Within the broad paradigm of landscape archaeology and the research field of plantation archaeology, historical archaeologists explore the theme of power and its various intersections between humans and their natural environment (Affleck 1990; Babson 1987a, 1987b, 1988, 1990; Epperson 1990, 1999; Rotman and Nassaney 1997; Voss 2008). For example, Babson (1990) and Epperson (1990) examined how spatial segregation and surveillance shaped
ideologies and socioeconomic class structures on plantations. Within plantation archaeology the scale of analysis expanded from studies of the planter-elite houses and enslaved laborer cabins to include entire plantations within watersheds or regions (Delle 2002; Ferguson and Babson 1986; Whitley 2002b, 2002c).

Historical archaeologists are expanding Michel Foucault’s concept of the Panopticon, his metaphor for modern ‘disciplinary’ societies, to plantations. In fact, several historical archaeologists approach the study of plantations by considering how individuals, planter-elites and enslaved laborers, perceive the landscape through existing power relationships (Armstrong and Kelly 2000; Bates 2007; Delle 1998, 1999, 2002; Epperson 1990; La Kose 2004; Randle 2011; Singleton 2001; Whitley 2002b, 2002c, 2003, 2008). These power relationships manifest the power of planter-elites in the form of their architectural and/or plantation designs (Deetz 1993; Epperson 2001; Glassie 1975; Upton 1985, 2010; Vlach 1990, 1993). For example, Epperson suggests that landscapes are assertions of power that display control and reinforce hierarchy (1999:159-172). In applying Foucault’s concept of the Panopticon, historical archaeologists hypothesize that the planter-elite’s manipulation of these designs created situations wherein the planter-elite believed that their surveillance and control of their enslaved labor force was complete and beyond reproach. By shaping the plantation landscape to
reflect their idea of domination, the planter-elites created a particular “way of seeing” the landscape that was both duplicitous and symbolic (Cosgrove 1984; Daniels 1993). Furthermore, the planter-elite on the East Branch of the Cooper River embedded “group identity, moral order, and social organization” in the land through kinship relationships (Thomas 2001:175). In this dissertation, I test the veracity of the panopticon theory at the plantations along the East Branch of the Cooper River through Geographic Information Systems analyses.

While scholarship on panoptic plantations focuses largely on the roles of the planter-elites, a few scholars examine the role of the enslaved laborers in the same landscape (Bates et al. 2016; Chenoweth et al. 2016; Delle 2016; Ellis and Ginsberg 2010). Most of these studies are situated within the theme of power/resistance or domination/resistance. Historical archaeologist Garrett Fesler points out that “the most intriguing reason for archaeologists to study ‘slave space’ is to reconstruct how enslaved Africans transformed the spaces imposed upon them into meaningful places” (2010:28). Fesler suggests that the enslaved laborers’ realm extended beyond the quarter, “spread[ing] out in the yard, segregating various activities in different zones” that blended “nature and culture” (2010:31).

Historical archaeologist James Delle (1998) theorizes that space is composed of three components: the material, social, and cognitive. Humans
design material space physically or by establishing definitions, descriptions or rules about the space. Relationships with others and the material space dictate social space. How people understand their social and material space underlies cognitive space.

Not only did enslaved laborers transform plantation landscapes into their own but they also created “boundaries of [enslaved laborer] neighborhoods [that] were permeable” (Kaye 2007:151). Furthermore, scholars are resisting the viewpoint that enslaved laborers were either victims or resisters (Ellis and Ginsburg 2010). Taking cues from historian Anthony Kaye (2007) and historical archaeologists Clifton Ellis and Rebecca Ginsburg (2010), this dissertation suggests that historical archaeologists reevaluate the notion that enslaved laborers were only resisters in the plantation landscape. Rather, instead of positioning enslaved laborers as passive victims of the panoptic system, I suggest that their cognitive understanding of the plantation landscape informed their mobility through the landscape. While it may be difficult to find archaeological remains of routes, enslaved labors traveled through the landscape in the performance of everyday activities or to escape the drudgery of enslavement (Brown 2012; Chenoweth et al. 2016; Delle 2008; Ginsburg 2010; Quintana 2010). This dissertation examines potential pathways available to the enslaved laborers within the East Branch plantation community. I suggest that future historical
archaeologists examine these potential pathways for archaeological remains of enslaved laborer activities.

The cognitive predictive models suggested in this dissertation will assist future historical archaeologists in examining patterns of enslaved laborer settlements in the Carolina Lowcountry as well as other geographical locations. Not only does this dissertation add to on-going research of power relations in the plantation landscape, it also adds to the understanding of neighbor-assisted surveillances between planter-elites and enslaved laborers.

**Purpose of the Study**

The ultimate purpose of this dissertation is to create a cognitive predictive model(s) that identify potential locations for archaeological evidence of enslaved laborer’s rituals and/or activities that were out-of-sight of the planter-elite’s perceived structure of surveillance and control. Drawing from a rich precedence of studies of the South Carolina Lowcountry first settlers, this dissertation continues previous historical archaeology scholarship that investigates models for the examination of settlement patterns.

As early as 1978, Stanley South presented “A Pilot Study for the Location of Certain Seventeenth Century Sites in Charleston County South” (South 1978). In his study, South employed the 1695 Thornton-Morden map and United States Coast and Geodetic Survey maps to locate sites between the Stono River and the
North Edisto River that were untouched by modern changes. South hypothesized that early settlements near navigable waters “resulted in residences and plantations being grouped in clusters forming interacting communities with kinship ties still seen in the area” in the 1970s (1980:25). South surmised that a strong settlement pattern emerged where the river linked community clusters on both sides of the river. South’s study revealed a community defined by close family and community ties within the river and creek systems that maintained upper class status control. Unfortunately, South did not examine the enslaved laborers beyond noting the presence of Colono-ware at several of the sites. While South’s study was purely archaeological in nature, he proposed that future settlement studies should be multidisciplinary, diachronic, and include input from anthropologists, historical geographers, and historians.

In 1986, Leland Ferguson proposed a new approach in Southern plantation archaeology – the study of a regional settlement system of slavery on both sides of the East Branch of the Cooper River. Ferguson followed Eugene Genovese’s (1974) notion that “the world of slaves was created by dialogue between slaves and planters” (1986:25). Ferguson argued that the settlement system was a negotiation between the planter-elite and the enslaved laborers who provided ‘advice’ to the placement of structures. Ferguson proposed to
document the locations of slave settlements and other cultural features in the East Branch community. From this proposal Ferguson and his graduate student David Babson created a composite map of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River. In recreating the community, they focused on the settlement pattern by locating where people lived and the development of the rice agriculture.

Specifically, this dissertation continues the Ferguson and Babson study by expanding upon Ferguson’s theory of settlement development and by introducing interpretations of the neighbor-assisted surveillances between the planter-elites and enslaved laborers. One of the theories to be tested is whether the planter-elite settlement pattern created an integral system for surveillance and control of their enslaved laborers. Another theory is that despite the system of surveillance and control placed upon them the enslaved laborers (re)created a thriving community. I argue that despite the planter-elites’ intentional manipulation of the environment, the enslaved laborers were able to circumvent the restrictions inherent in planter-elites’ cognitive landscape. By examining the East Branch plantations at the regional scale, both internal and cross-site observations become apparent.
Research Questions

This dissertation explores whether the panoptic plantation theory applies at the regional scale to several plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River and suggests the potential pathways that enslaved laborers created to avoid planter-elite surveillance and control, using a mixed methods design. Answers to these questions will assist historical archaeologists in developing methods to explore potential sites of enslaved laborer rituals and/or activities. The rationale for combining quantitative and qualitative approaches is that the qualitative data provide a general background for the research problem, for example, the factors that created the social and cultural landscapes of the plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River. The quantitative data provide environmental datasets for the region and its analysis will result in potential cognitive predictive models that contribute to understanding enslaved laborer mobility through the region.

In the qualitative phase of this dissertation, Chapters Two to Four research questions address the historical background of the landscape, people, and plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River.

The guiding research question for the qualitative phase is:
To what extent did the planter-elites at the plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River create and maintain an elite ideology that structured perceptions of the plantation landscape?

The specific research sub-questions for the qualitative phase are:

1. Who were the planter-elites, mixed-race elites, mulattoes, and enslaved African and African-Americans laborers living on plantations in the East Branch of the Cooper River from initial settlement in the late 1600s to approximately 1822?

2. What were the identifying characteristics of each group in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that structured ideologies and perceptions of the East Branch plantation landscape?

3. What strategies did the planter-elite develop to maintain their elite ideology and perceptions of the East Branch plantation landscape?

4. What were the implications of the American Revolution and the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy that affected planter-elites’ and enslaved laborers’ ideologies and perceptions of the East Branch plantation landscapes?

In Chapters Five to Seven, the two-part quantitative phase of this dissertation, research questions address the implementation of cognitive predictive modelling and the analyses of the models. The research sub-questions
in the second part of the quantitative phase presented in Chapter Seven are formulated on the results of the first part of the quantitative phase presented in Chapter Six. The guiding research questions for the quantitative phase are:

To what extent and where did the enslaved laborers create potential pathways to avoid the perceived planter-elite panoptic plantation landscape on plantations at the East Branch of the Cooper River?

The specific research sub-questions for the first part of the quantitative phase are:

1. To what extent was visibility from the centerline of the East Branch of the Cooper River?

2. To what extent was intervisibility from the planter-elites’ houses at plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River?

3. To what extent was intervisibility from the enslaved laborers’ settlements at plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River?

4. What are the potential areas of potential planter-elite surveillance and control over the enslaved laborer settlements?

The specific research sub-questions for the second part of the quantitative phase are:

1. What cost factors influence mobility through the natural landscape?
2. Based on the identified cost factors, where are the potential paths, corridors or networks that the enslaved laborers may have used to move through the actual plantation landscape and the perceived panoptic plantation landscape?

**Definitions and Terms**

The term *Lowcountry* refers to the original counties of Berkeley, Charleston, and Colleton in South Carolina.

The term *Charles Town* refers to the Colonial period until 1719, the term *Charlestown* refers to the period from 1719 to the American Revolution, and the term *Charleston* refers to the period following the American Revolution.

The term *natural landscape* refers to physical resources, which includes climate, landforms, soils, vegetation, and drainage systems.

The *cultural landscape* is defined as the imprint of humans on the earth, resulting from human interaction with the natural landscape.

The term *enslaved laborer landscape* situates the spaces and places where enslaved laborers lived, worked, and developed a community.

The term *habitus* is Bourdieu’s (1977) concept that an individual’s position in the social structure results from the everyday habits of individuals.

The term *cognition*, within landscape archaeology, refers to the knowledge of the landscape that influences perception.
The term *perception* refers to the awareness of the landscape and includes feelings of being in the landscape.

The term *cognitive archaeology* refers to the study of the ideals, values, and beliefs that constituted a society’s worldview.

The term *panoptic plantation* is based on Foucault’s (1975) concept of the Panopticon and is applied to plantation landscapes wherein the planter-elite designed their plantations to fit the Georgian style, which symbolized their wealth via architecture, landscaping, and vista.

The term *viewshed* refers to how visible locations on the landscape are from a specific vantage point, typically as a *line-of-sight*, while the term *cumulative viewshed analysis* refers to a value of intensity of visibility at the cell level of analysis.

The term *least cost path* refers to the cheapest route defined by costs from a known destination to the known source.

The term *cost* refers to a factor, such as time, distance or environment, that incurs difficulty or an outlay of resources.

**Procedures**

A mixed methodology is used in this dissertation to address the research questions. The multidisciplinary nature of this dissertation incorporates theories
and methods based in the disciplines of historical archaeology, history, cultural geography, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

The East Branch of the Cooper River in Berkeley County, South Carolina is rich in historical and archaeological documentation. The majority of qualitative data is from various primary and secondary historical documentation including court records (CCRMC; Wills) historical works (Bacot 1917, 1922; Bailey 1989; Bates and Leland 2015; Bowen 1952; Cross 1985; Hawley 1946; Heitzler 2005, 2012; Irving 1842; Jervey 1902; Koger 1995; Leiding 1921; Miles 2004; Orvin 1973; Roberts 1965; Russell 2007; Salley 1915; Schweninger 1990; Smith 1900, 1911a, 1911b, 1913, 1917a, 1917b, 1931, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c; Smith 2010, 2012; Stoney 1932; Wood 1974), databases (BCHS), theses and dissertations (Adams 1990; Affleck 1990; Babson 1987a; Barile 1999; Byra 19966; Cody 1982a; Connor 1989; Converse 2011; Lees 1978; Terry 1981), family writings (Ashby n.d.; Ball 1929; Ball 1998; Child 1942; Deas 1909; Poyas 1855, 1870), family archival papers (Baldwin, Ball, Deas, DeSaussure, Ford, Laurens, Ravenel), historical and modern newspapers and historical magazines (SCHGM, SCHS), and archaeological studies (Babson 1987b, 1988; Brockington and Associates 1996; Cable et al.1992; Judge 1994; Lees 1980; Poplin and Philips 2011; Soil Systems, Inc. 1982; Steen 2011; Stine 1991; Tidewater Atlantic Research, Inc. 1995; Whitley and Hicks 2003; Zierden et al.1986).
Quantitative data is gathered from primary sources as well as online geographical datasets. Plats and historical and modern maps were gathered from several sources (Ferguson’s private collection, SCHS, online data sources). Historical maps are fundamental for providing archaeologists a snapshot into the past. These maps provide us with a schematic understanding of space as perceived by those who lived at that time.

Analyses were conducted using ESRI’s ArcGIS 10.5.1 software and the tools in the Spatial Analyst Extension. As the leading provider of Geographic Information Systems software, ArcGIS is cost efficient, for a relatively small annual fee, and downloadable on any desktop or laptop system. The methods were appropriate because ArcGIS analyzes spatial data in a way that offers historical archaeologists the means to examine past environments by creating artificial surfaces that represent the study area. Acquired datasets and derived datasets represent geographical, ecological, and documentary variables. For the first part of the quantitative analysis, the method is the visibility analysis to investigate the planter-elite’s surveillance and control on the plantations of the East Branch of the Cooper River. For the second part of the quantitative analysis, the method is the least cost path analysis to investigate the potential paths/pathways available from enslaved laborer settlements that avoided the planter-elite’s surveillance and control. Using GIS does not tell us exactly where
archaeological evidence will be found; however, as a sampling strategy this methodology helps historical archaeologists to predict potential archaeological sites for future investigation.

**Significance of the Study**

This dissertation will add to research on surveillance and control, as well as mobility, on panoptic plantations by identifying potential pathways of the enslaved laborers in historical archaeology, using a mixed methods design. In centering the focus on the enslaved laborers, this dissertation contributes significantly to current historical archaeology literature that examines panoptic plantations as well as contributes to underdeveloped research focusing on enslaved laborer mobility. The primary significance of this dissertation is that no book-length historical archaeology study has explored the mobility and potential pathways of enslaved laborers on panoptic plantations.

This research is significant for historical archaeologists interested in the African-American archaeology, plantation archaeology, and landscape archaeology. Employing the predictive power of Geographical Information Systems may assist historical archaeologists in developing robust cognitive predictive models, which will enhance our understanding of past human behavior and cognition. Although this dissertation is confined to the plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River, the cognitive predictive models
proposed in the study are adaptable for similar studies at plantations in the southeast United States, Caribbean, and elsewhere.

**Limitations of the Study**

While this study appears to cover the plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River in depth, much more investigation needs to be done. The limits of this study include unrecorded plats and other historical documentation that limited the ability to complete a study of one hundred percent coverage of the East Branch plantations. Perhaps with the passage of time, documents will surface from attics, family files, and unprocessed archival holdings. It has been thirty years since Ferguson initially began his study of the East Branch plantations. Some, but not all, documents have been uncovered that were previously unavailable to Ferguson. Perhaps in another thirty years additional documents will be unearthed to complete the project. There is a potential for bias in the study of plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River and with the analytical interpretations because, as a historical archaeologist, I bring my personal bias to the study by the chosen research methodologies employed. Relying on computer software is not the same as digging in the dirt. Hopefully, the two approaches will survive, side-by-side, to challenge future historical archaeologists interested in settlement patterns, plantation archaeology, and enslaved laborers to incorporate mixed methodologies.
Organization of the Study

Chapters Two through Four present the qualitative phase of the dissertation. Chapter Two sets forth the concept of landscape theory as employed in geography, anthropology, and archaeology and examines the cultural and natural landscapes of the East Branch of the Cooper River. Chapter Three examines the ideology and mindset of the various groups of people living along the East Branch of the Cooper River. Chapter Four is an in-depth presentation of plantation ownership for each plantation on the East Branch of the Cooper River from initial settlement in the late 1600s to approximately 1822. Plantation owners often repeated the same names within the same generations and across generations; therefore, all names include known dates of their respective births and deaths in parenthesis after their names to aid in distinguishing generations with repetitive names.

Chapters Five through Eight present the quantitative phase of the dissertation. Chapter Five introduces the concepts of cognition, decision-making, and the datasets for the cognitive predictive modeling. Chapter Six focuses on the panoptic plantation theory and presents quantitative analyses using Visual Analysis to test the veracity the theory and to predict potential areas of social control. Chapter Seven examines enslaved laborers’ mobility through the
panoptic plantation landscape using Least Cost Path Analyses to identify potential pathways.

Chapter Eight is a conclusion chapter that wraps up the qualitative theories and quantitative analyses together.
CHAPTER TWO
THE EAST BRANCH OF THE COOPER RIVER

Since the publishing of *A View of South Carolina, as Respects Her Natural and Civil Concerns*, the first state geography (Drayton 1802), many scholars have used various criteria to define the Lowcountry. Drayton described the Lowcountry in general terms as “Lower Carolina from the sea to the sand hills [sic]” (1802:11). Historically, the Lowcountry was defined as an area of settlement dominated by commercial plantations based on rice and indigo, large landholdings, and slave labor along the coastal area of South Carolina. Today, the Carolina Lowcountry, characterized by extensive tracts of marsh, estuary, forest, and numerous isolated Sea Islands, consists of several counties: Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Colleton, Dorchester, Georgetown, and Jasper. In this dissertation, the Lowcountry refers to the original counties of Berkeley, Charleston, and Colleton.

Initial settlement occurred along four major waterways: the Ashley, Cooper, Stono, and Wando Rivers (Edelson 2006:130). By the mid-eighteenth century, settlers had dispersed ‘up and down’ the coast. The most populous settlement developed on Goose Creek, a tributary of the Cooper River. A variety of people settled along the East Branch; Dissenters from England and French
Huguenots sought religious freedom; Irish and English Barbadians sought wealth as planters; and Africans came, not of their own free will, but rather as enslaved laborers. As the demand for laborers and rice production increased, planter-elites in the East Branch region accumulated wealth that enabled them to grow to economic prominence by the Revolutionary War.

Beginning in the late 1690s, rice and indigo supplemented early colonial exports such as deerskins, naval stores (pitch and tar), lumber and subsistence crops such as Indian corn, cow peas, and meat (raising livestock) (Drayton 1802:113-114). Many scholars have explored the technology, labor conditions, and social and cultural practices associated with rice cultivation (Carney 2001; Chaplin 1993; Coclanis 1989; Edelson 2006; David Eltis et al. 2007; Littlefield 1981; Porcher 2014; Wood 1974). Rice cultivation evolved over time. Initially, during the frontier phase, planters grew small quantities of rice on high land as an upland crop without irrigation, a technique known as ‘dry’ cultivation; however, because rice required rich soil and frequent flowing water, planter-elites moved to ‘wet’ rice cultivation in cleared fresh water swamplands along creeks and branches at some distance from the river (Drayton 1802:115; Porcher 2014). Planters employed two types of swamp cultivation: river swamp next, to fresh water rivers and inland swamp, unconnected to tides or navigation (Porcher 2014:13). Planters had their enslaved laborers impound water and apply it to the
fields. Beginning in the 1720s and 1730s, planter-elites began a long experimentation with tidal cultivation that, after the Revolutionary War, consisted of a complex system of banks, ditches, floodgates and trunks, that increased rice production and profitability (Porcher 2014). Planters used the tidal marshes to flood and drain the fields during each semi-diurnal tidal cycle; at high tide, the marsh was covered and at low tide, the marsh was bare and uncovered (Porcher 2014:13-14).

Plantations along the East Branch flourished in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as rice became the most prosperous export industry in the Lowcountry. That is until the Revolutionary War resulted in the depletion of large numbers of laborers required to maintain the complex system, who fled, left with the British or were conscripted by the American and/or British armies and the negligence of crops, which. Relying on fewer laborers, widespread adoption of tidal cultivation began in the 1780s; earlier methods persisted in areas where tidal cultivation was inappropriate (Chaplin 1992:42).

The examination of how planter-elites constructed landscapes to observe their enslaved laborers has become a useful analysis of the relationship between humans and power dynamics embedded intentionally or unintentionally in cultural landscapes. This dissertation examines the plantation landscape of the
elite and enslaved. Specifically, it addresses in how humans created, lived in, and made meaningful their landscape: natural and cultural.

This chapter focuses on the natural and cultural landscape of the East Branch of the Cooper River (hereafter East Branch). The first section examines the concept of landscape theory as employed in geography, anthropology, and archaeology. The next section examines the natural landscape of the East Branch. Landforms, soils, and a long growing season combined to create a distinctive ecological niche consisting of tidal marshes, former tidal ricefields, inland ricefields and reserves, as well as upland agricultural fields and timbered and reforested woodlands. The Carolina Lowcountry has a long history of anthropogenic changes; embankments, introduced to impound water within a fixed boundary, are an excellent example of an anthropogenic change (Kjerfve 1976). Finally, the last section examines the cultural landscape and settlement pattern of the East Branch. Historic settlement patterns featured a combination of factors including access to navigable waterways, suitable agricultural terrain (well-drained, fertile soils) and proximity to other travel arteries. Other cultural landscape features included paths, canals, bridges, fields, dams, reservoirs, causeways, fences, cemeteries, and other man-made structures. The study area comprises territory from Lower St. John’s Berkeley Parish, along the north bank of the East Branch, and portions of St. Thomas and St. Denis Parishes, along the
south banks of the East Branch. St. John’s Berkeley parish stretched from the upper reaches of the Cooper River to the Santee River in modern Berkeley and Orangeburg counties.

**The Concept of Landscape**

Historical archaeologists use interdisciplinary methods from geography, ecology, history, anthropology, and archaeology in the study of landscape. Landscape is often classified as either natural or cultural. While the two concepts may appear to be separate phenomena, any given environment contains a blend of both. As such, no environment was a pristine natural setting but rather a landscape transformed over time by human occupation (*c.f.* Sauer 1925). Throughout this dissertation, the term natural landscape refers to physical resources, which includes climate, landforms, soils, vegetation, and drainage systems. Following definitions established by Carl Sauer, the natural landscape formed the framework within which the cultural landscape developed. In this dissertation, the cultural landscape is defined as the imprint of humans on the earth, resulting from human interaction with the natural landscape.

The origins of an American theoretical claim for cultural landscapes as the product of human activity was accredited to geographer Carl Sauer’s influential work “Morphology of Landscape” (1925:19-54). Sauer’s methodological approach provided a way to organize and interpret various physical features and
the complex relationships that existed between them. By stressing culture as a geographical agent, Sauer countered environmental determinism scholarship, which promoted the belief that physical factors determined cultural and societal development. Sauer’s classic cultural landscape definition remains central: “The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a cultural group. Culture is the agent, the natural area the medium, the cultural landscape is the result” (1925). For Sauer, human activity made a lasting mark on the natural landscape. Sauer viewed landscape as a ‘palimpsest’ that reflected repetitive use and structured modification of an ideational landscape. Recently, cultural geographers abandoned Sauer’s distinction between nature and culture in favor of ‘social nature,’ where nature and culture were dialectically constructed (c.f. Castree and Braun 2001); the social nature approach placed more attention to the role of power, cultural contestation, and the active role of ‘insiders’.

Furthermore, cultural geographers have contributed to the examination of the meaning and construction of cultural landscape, not only as an ideology with its own constructions and viewpoints, but also as a representation of and as a specific way of seeing the land (Cosgrove 1984). Cultural landscape has been defined as representing the social or cultural significance of physical order (Meinig 1979); as a form of representation (Mitchell 1996:29), both as art and as a complex system of meanings that were read, grasped and struggled over
(Duncan and Duncan 1988; Duncan 1990:117-126); and as part of textual and metaphorical discourses (Duncan and Duncan 1988; Barnes and Duncan 1992). Mitchell (2005:49) offered one of the most common understandings of the term ‘landscape’ as a representation or pattern of ‘things on the land,’ such as trees, buildings, streets, factories, open spaces, and so forth. Pierce K. Lewis suggested that human landscape, as autobiography, could be read as the reflection of “our tastes, our values, our aspiration, and even our fears” (1979:11-32). In addition, geographers examined how racialization of place constructed particular landscapes that defined and reinforced racialized social hierarchies and created landscapes of social exclusion (Hoelscher 2003; Schein 1997). These scholars revealed that ‘cultural landscape’ is holistic, incorporating every aspect of culture and its material expression.

Archaeologists have long expressed an interest in site distribution through the framework of settlement patterns and spatial analysis, rooted in several disciplines such as prehistoric archaeology, historical geography, vernacular architecture, and cultural ecology. For example, Henry Glassie (1975) and James Deetz (1977) used the landscape approach to explore how the spatial relations of buildings revealed cultural patterns that were indicative of past ways of thinking. Kenneth Lewis (1985:35-65) examined activity patterns within a colonial plantation settlement; he concluded that a close correlation existed
between function and layout. Joe W. Joseph (1993:57-73) considered the archaeology of ideology as expressed through symbolization and classification; he examined the evolution of ideology from the seventeenth century to the end of the Antebellum era on Georgia and South Carolina plantations. Joseph concluded that expressions of social and ideological relations occurred symbolically within plantations, as evidenced by settlement systems, architecture, and material remains.

Landscape approaches in historical archaeology persisted as the emphasis shifted from a focus on settlement patterns to a focus on social dynamics within space, spatial manipulation, and understanding power and power relationships. Charles Orser, for example, emphasized that the “interrelation between space and power provided a key to the archaeological study of the past” (1988:320c). Further, Orser (1988:321c) argued that plantations provided the perfect arena in which to begin the search for power and space.

Beginning in the late-twentieth century, an increasing number of historical archaeologists contributed to landscape studies by applying Marxian theoretical approaches to examine the dichotomy of domination and resistance in power dynamics and race. Marxist geographer Don Mitchell (1996) examined the worker’s landscape; the tension between capital and labor concealed uncomfortable truths or projected the interests of the elites. Mitchell (1996)
insisted that there was only one true material landscape, against which ideological constructions obscure or mask the true nature of landscape. Mitchell argued that the material formation of landscape, its shaping and reshaping in which social structures and cultural worlds were enfolded, alluded to the notion of landscapes as deceitful or merely a partial view of a scenic image.

Bringing the Marxian approach into the twenty-first century, Suzanne Spencer-Wood and Sherene Baugher (2010) broadly defined the ‘cultural landscape of power.’ Their definition involved an analysis of the relationship between human and power dynamics that were intentionally or unintentionally embedded in cultural landscapes, as well as in the natural and built environments (structures, fences, roads, paths, bridges, tunnels, dams, fountains, wells, etc.) that humans altered. Within the context of historical archaeology, Spencer-Wood’s and Baugher’s definition permits analysis at various scales: from gardens and house yards to farms; and from sites, neighborhoods, villages, communities, towns, and cities to regions.

The most notable Marxian landscape study in historical archaeology focused on the elite gardens of William Paca in Annapolis, Maryland (Leone 1984, 1988, 1989; Leone et al. 1987; Leone and Hurry 1998). Building on works of Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley (1982), Georg Lukács (1971), and John H. Rowe (1965), Mark Leone identified the garden as the materialization of social
identity and power in the landscape (Leone 1984); vanishing perspectives across descending terraces and geometric ‘wilderness’ affirmed ‘natural’ control of the social order. Formal gardens represented capitalist landowners’ assertion of identity and power in colonial North America. According to Leone, classist and racist biases in archaeological research unwittingly reified, legitimated, and naturalized dominant capitalist and racist cultural ideologies. However, Leone has been criticized by a number of scholars. Orser (1996), for example, criticized Leone’s focus on the elite, which negated the role of subordinate groups and Spencer-Wood (1993, 2002) concurred that Leone failed to analyze the role of enslaved workers.

By contrast, Ann Yentsch (1994) argued that slaves exerted their social agency in making some plantings that were not included in the elite’s garden design. Lydia Pulsipher considered slaves’ gardens as evidence of “construct[ing] a decent life for themselves within a hostile system” (1994:217). Pulsipher argued that movement and immersion yielded meaning: an identity of resistance, independence, and security. Martha Zierden (2010) argued that despite constructing ordered formal gardens for the elite, slaves used their agency in a ‘parallel’ world to mold the landscape for themselves. In her study of urban Charles Town, Zierden concluded that slaves cultivated and sold agricultural produce from their own vegetable gardens. In another example,
Timothy Ruppel et al. (2003) revealed how African spiritual spaces, created in houses and gardens and often hidden in plain sight, were coded landscapes. Douglas Armstrong and Kenneth Kelly (2000) explored how enslaved Africans modified an imposed social order and redefined boundaries to conform to a distinct African Jamaican society. These examples reveal a definitive shift away from studies that focus on the elite class to a focus on the enslaved.

Of direct importance for this dissertation is scholarship that examined how the manipulation of the built environment reproduced and naturalized existing ideology, in particular, how the planter-elite used landscape to facilitate surveillance on plantations (Delle 1999, 2002; Epperson 1999; Singleton 2001). Terrance Epperson examined visibility as a primary motive for planter- elites to design spaces to “make things seeable” while at the same time to produce “spaces of constructed invisibility” to monitor slaves’ behavior and to conceal their presence (1999:170). In his studies, James Delle (1999, 2002) examined the dialectics of power in the internal arrangement of plantation landscapes in Jamaica. Delle argued that, at the regional scale, coffee planter- elites created a commanding view of the valley; planter- elites consciously placed buildings in a manner that maximized surveillance and reinforced white dominance. Delle concluded that the planter- elites not only enforced their dominance on a regional level, but they further reinforced their dominance on a local scale in the layout of
individual plantations. Theresa A. Singleton concurred, “Delle demonstrates how the placement of the overseer’s house served as a central point in the surveillance in much the same way a guard tower does” (2001:105). In her own study of the spatial dialectical relationship between slaveowner’s control of plantation space and the enslaved laborer’s resistance in Cuba, Singleton argued that the roof, second level, or even a rooftop terrace possibly served as surveillance devices over the slave settlement and other locations.

Despite the apparent overlap of theoretical approaches to landscape studies between geography and historical archaeology, a divide remains apparent. In 2011, cultural geographer Amy Mills and historical archaeologist Martha Zierden served as commentators for a Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) session on landscape archaeology. Mills praised the work of historical archaeologists in embracing geographic theory and landscape approaches in their studies. Zierden, on the other hand, questioned the appropriateness of such an approach. Zierden urged archaeologist to not get “caught up in the landscape approach” that relies on suppositions and “touchy-feely” interpretations; she reminded archaeologists to “always connect their interpretations to artifacts” (quoted during SHA session). Their differences reflected not only a divide between processualism and postprocessualism but also reflected the increased cross-disciplinary training of current historical archaeologists.
Archaeologists interested in phenomenological approaches to landscapes of the oppressed can benefit from several historical studies that explore enslaves’ perceptions of the natural landscape as a part of power struggle over contested space (Brown 2012; Ellis and Ginsburg 2010; Joyner 1984; Kaye 2007; Vlach 1993, 2002). Ras Michael Brown examined how diverse Africans from West-Central Africa conceived the ‘land of the living’ and the ‘land of the dead’ in the natural landscape of the Lowcountry. Brown emphasized that, “whites interpreted the Lowcountry as a land of plantations and thus as a landscape of enslavement” (2012:41). Further, Brown argued that Africans employed an ‘African frontier ideology’ based on an African ‘conceptual kit’ to understand their place on the landscape; the conceptual kit contained a spiritually based understanding of physical landscape that was steeped deeply in the Kongo cosmology. Charles Joyner’s influential work reconstructed African-American culture from a mid-nineteenth century slave community of diverse Africans in All Saints Parish in the Carolina Lowcountry. In a new interpretation of slave communities, Anthony E. Kaye examined Antebellum Mississippi slaves who envisioned their world in terms of ‘neighborhoods’ defined as ‘adjoining plantations’; Kaye argues that intimate relations pulled slaves away from the plantation core while work pushed them towards the core. John Michael Vlach explores the role of plantation landscape from the viewpoint of the enslaved. In his seminal work
Back of the Big House (1993), Vlach examined the plantation landscape, its structures and placement, from the point of view of the enslaved and in The Planter’s Prospect (2002), Vlach examined the erasure of African Americans from plantation paintings created before the Civil War. Ellis and Ginsberg’s anthology, Cabin, Quarter, Plantation (2010), brings together archaeological and historical scholarship regarding the built environment, architecture, and landscape of enslavement.

The Natural Landscape

As one of the three original plantation settlements in the Carolinas, the East Branch became important in the natural and cultural development of the Lowcountry. The physical characteristics of the natural landscape determined its economic and social importance, which developed over time. The natural landscape, important in archaeological settlement studies, is key to our understanding of how past societies understood the world around them.

Located in present-day Berkeley County, the East Branch is entirely within the Lower Pine Belt of the Coastal Plain region on the northern boundary of the Sea Island section of the South Atlantic Slope as shown on figure 2.1 (Kovacik 1989). The topography is level to gently undulating with elevations ranging from tide level to one hundred fifty feet above; elevations along the East Branch range from tide level to approximately twenty-five feet (SCDHEC 2013:67). The land
along the river bluffs is more rolling, well drained and well aerated; while the surface from the bluffs is nearly level and contains ‘bays’ and large savannas (ibid). Generally, the bays contain densely covered bay, gallberry, and moss with standing surface water; the pine savannas are open areas with pinewoods; and the open savannas contains water and grasses (ibid).

Geologically, a series of island-beach ridge sequences that, when viewed on the landscape, appear as a series of broad, depositional terraces run sub-parallel to the coastline and extending inland approximately sixty-two miles (one hundred km) to the Orangeburg Scarp (Colquhoun 1969, 1974). A terrace is defined as “a narrow, gently sloping coastal platform veneered by sedimentary deposits and bounded along one edge by a steeper descending slope and along the other by a steeper ascending slope” (Neuendorf 2005:663). A scarp is defined as “a relatively steep sloping surface that generally faces one direction and separates level or gently sloping surfaces” (Neuendorf 2005:577). Terraces, temporary oceans floors that formed over time (two in the Pliocene, four in the Pleistocene, and one in Holocene) from the rise and fall of the sea level, influenced settlement patterns throughout the prehistory and history of the region. From oldest to most recent, they are Silver Bluff (eight feet), Princess Anne (seventeen feet), Pamlico (twenty-five feet), Talbot (upper forty-five feet; lower thirty-five feet), Penholoway (seventy feet), and Wicomico (one hundred
feet) (Colquhoun, et al.1972). The East Branch, located primarily on the lower Talbot Terrace (named in 1901 by George Burbank Shattuck for Talbot County, Maryland), is between the Suffolk Scarp and the Bethera Scarp (SCDNR). The Bethera Scarp (named by Colquhoun in 1965) separates the upper and lower Talbot Terrace; the landward extent is the Summerville Scarp and the seaward extent is the Suffolk Scarp (Doar 2014:35, 44-45). Consisting of very fine gray to red to pink thin-bedded sand and clay, the terrace ranges in altitude from twenty-five to forty-two feet above sea level. Lying west of longitude eighty degrees, Talbot Terrace represents irregular patches that were islands in the Pamlico Sea (Cooke 1936:7, 149). The Lower Coastal Plain’s terraces, separated by scarps, contributed to the distinctive stair-step topography and soil of the East Branch.

In 1899, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) began publishing soil surveys. For Berkeley County, there are three published surveys on the USDA website: Latimer et al.1918, Long 1980, and the current online Web Soil Survey. The earliest published report, Latimer et al.(1918), divided Berkeley County soils into two general classes: (1) upland soils, of sedimentary origin, derived from beds of unconsolidated sands, clays, and first-bottom floodplain steps that are subject to regular flooding and (2) alluvial soils, deposited within the present flood plains of the streams. Upland soils include the Norfolk, Ruston,
Coxville, and Portsmouth Series. The first bottom soils include the Johnston, Congaree, and Tidal Marsh Series.

Latimer et al. (1918:42) provided a general descriptive ranking of East Branch soils. Norfolk and Ruston soils were well drained and the most important for cultivation. Coxville soils were most extensive but required artificial drainage for cultivation. Portsmouth soils were poorly drained and not used for farming; small areas, however, were used for rice production. For instance, abandoned canals, ditches, and dikes indicated that Portsmouth clay loam was used for rice production; this land, subsequently, was abandoned during the Civil War. Johnston soils were poorly drained and not farmed but were possibly used extensively for growing rice; however, the soil was very heavy and required the energy of draft animals to work it. For example, Johnston loam required a canal to drain the entire swamp. Tidal Marsh soil was considered of little value; historically, it was diked and used for rice production. Over the years, as soil identification became more sophisticated and refined, historic series names did not carry forward, hence, the series names from the 1916 soil survey were used for reference. Additional detailed descriptions of each soil series and a soil map are discussed in chapter five.

Rivers in the Coastal Plain follow the topographic land slope from northwest to southeast and typically meander into wide, flat floodplains. The
Santee River Basin is the second largest drainage basin on the East Coast and the principal drainage for southeastern South Carolina (Conrads and Smith 1996:5; Kjerfve 1976:45). Within the Santee River Basin is the Cooper River Basin in Berkeley, Charleston, and Dorchester counties. The Cooper River and its tributaries originate in Biggin Swamp and other swamps, drain the central portion of the state, and empty into the Charleston harbor (Drayton 1802:35). Largely drained by the Santee and Cooper Rivers, the natural landscape is tidally-influenced, nearly level, dissected by broad shallow valleys, and contains meandering stream channels (SCDHEC 2013:67). Both sides of the East Branch include swamps (Chipper, Darlington, and Jericho) along various creeks (French Quarter, Quinby, Huger, and Turkey). Leland Ferguson and David Babson (1986:4) noted that East Branch freshwater swamps were less than five feet in elevation, while surrounding landforms rose to elevations between twenty and thirty-five feet within one mile of the river.

As shown on map 2.2, the Cooper River, a relatively short river system, divides into a ‘tee’ at about twenty miles north of Charleston. The East Branch of the Cooper River, bounding along the centerline of a ridge that divides French Quarter Creek from the main channel of the Cooper River, extends northeast to the town of Huger (red star) and the West Branch Cooper River extends northward to Moncks Corner (red star), the current county seat. Before the river
empties into the Atlantic Ocean, it accepts drainage from Back River, Goose Creek, Wando River, and Ashley River. Historically, Ashley, Cooper, and Stono Rivers (connected to Ashley River) served as the primary travel arteries for plantation goods, services, and people, as well as, irrigation for the successful production of rice (Drayton 1802:30; Edelson 2006:130).

As shown on map 2.3, the East Branch Cooper River Watershed occupies 119,005 acres and is almost entirely within the Francis Marion National Forest (FMNF, officially designated in 1936) (SCDHEC 2013:80). Subject to tidal influences throughout its eight-mile reach before the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the head of navigability for pole boats and other small vessels extended to Huger’s Bridge (Drayton 1802:35; Irving 1842:79; USACE 1977). In the 1820s, John Wilson (1789-1833) reported that the East Branch was navigable “for vessels drawing 5 feet water” and terminated “at Huger’s bridge” (Kohn and Glenn 1938:A14); Wilson was United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Major for a brief time and was the first Civil and Military Engineer of South Carolina in 1817. One of the East Branch tributaries, French Quarter Creek, was an outlet for inland plantations and navigable for about five miles to Spring Hill Plantation; however, sometime between 1762 and 1800, Thomas Dearington, once owner of Spring Hill Plantation, dammed the creek with a mile and a half long canal (Irving 1842:49; NRHP 2002:7; Stoney 1932:129-130). Historically, the
East Branch wetlands were part of a tidal estuary that was impounded extensively for rice cultivation during the 1700s and 1800s.

South Carolina’s climate is humid and tropical with an abundant precipitation distributed fairly even throughout the year. From May until the end of September, summers are hot and humid; winters are generally mild, although occasionally temperatures reach below freezing. For example, Drayton stated, that “in the years 1791 … [to] … 1798, it never rose above 93, nor fell below 17” (1802:24). Furthermore, during October and November, known as an ‘Indian Summer’, the days are warm, dry, and sunny while the nights are cool. The growing season averages about two hundred ninety days, or eighty percent, of the year.

A common feature of the Lowcountry is its tropical cyclones of hurricane force; peak hurricane season occurs in late summer and early fall. Before the mid-nineteenth century, Charleston witnessed three major hurricanes. According to early writers, the Great Carolina Hurricane occurred during incoming tide on 13-15 September 1752; in a forty-mile radius around Charles Town, barns and outbuilding were flattened, half of the rice crop was destroyed, and over one hundred enslaved laborers died on Sullivan’s Island (Edgar 2006:161; Mercantini 2002). Another severe storm struck Charleston and Sullivan’s Island on September 27, 1822, just a few months after the Denmark Vesey uprising (q.v.
chapter 5) (Ludlum 1963:45; Rubillo 2006:66-72). According to modern classifications, the 1822 hurricane would have been classified as a category 3 or greater and was responsible for the deaths of over three hundred slaves on the Santee River at Winyah Bay near Georgetown (Mayes 2006:1, 38, 86). During this same storm, Limerick Plantation owner Isaac Ball reported that his sloop was badly damaged in the harbor and one of his crewmen, Bengal, drowned (Fraser 2006:74).

The Cultural Landscape and Settlement Patterns

As far back as 10,000 BC, Native Americans have occupied the Carolina Lowcountry. Many different small bands existed along the Carolina coast below Charleston to Savannah (Swanton 1946:16). Between 1562 and 1751, the Cusabo (Corsaby) occupied the coast while the Coosa occupied inland rivers, including Ashley, Edisto, Ashepoo, Combahee, Salkehatchie, and Coosawhatchie (Edelson 2006:24-33; Gallay 2002; Swanton 1946). Originally, Cusabo was used for the Coosa River and literally meant ‘Kussah River’ (Waddell 2004:263). John R. Swanton divided the Cusabo into sub-tribes: Ashepoo, Combahee, Coosa (Coosaw, Cussoe, Kussoe), Edisto (Edistow), Escamaçu (St. Helena), Etiwan (Irwan, Eutow, Etiwa, Etiwaw, Itawan, Eutaw, Etavans), Kiawah, Stono, Wando, Wappoo, and Wimboo. Gene Waddell (2004:254) identified additional tribes: Bohicket, Hoya, Kussah, Kussoe, Mayon, Sampa, Stalame, Touppa, Wimbee, and
Witcheaugh. Swanton and Waddell also identified non-Cusabo Indians in the area: Sewee and Santee. From a Euro-centric viewpoint, settlers considered them ‘settlement Indians’ because they lived among the settlers as opposed to those tribes who lived at a distance from the early settlements (Edelson 2006:31; Swanton 1922). In actuality, from a Native American viewpoint, it was the settlers who initially settled among the Native Americans. Furthermore, James Mooney (1928) divided the Cusabo into the northern Cusabo and the southern Cusabo (table 2.1).

Swanton (1922:18-19, 21) associated these smaller bands with the larger Muskogean tribe. However, to the contrary, Blair Rudes, (2004) in his significant linguistic study, connected the Cusabo to the Taino in the Caribbean. Several sources provided descriptions and identification of early Lowcountry Native Americans (Act of 1707; Mooney 1894; Bartram 1791; Mathews [1680] 1954; Milling 1940; Rudes 2001; South 1977; Swanton 1922). For a detail analysis of where tribes actually resided in the Lowcountry, refer to Waddell (2004).

Although Drayton (1802:92) estimated that at many as “thirty to forty thousand souls” occupied the entire state, Swanton (1946) estimated that by 1600 about fifteen thousand lived in Carolina. Early settlers lived among the Cusabo, learned Native agricultural techniques for planting corn, beans, and peas, and avoided the ‘starving time’ experienced by settlers in Virginia (Edelson 2006:31-
With increasing European settlement by the late 1600s, these small tribes ceded most of their land in the Lowcountry to Europeans. The most well-known tribe, the Yemassee or Yamasee, who settled in the lower portion of the Lowcountry circa 1685 (Helsley 2005:26) and were hostile to the Cusabo, decelerated European settler expansion in the early eighteenth century until the Yemassee War (1715-1717), when they were defeated and relocated. Furthermore, exploitation, the Native American slave trade (local and to the West Indies), smallpox and other diseases, and warfare accelerated the disappearance of most Native Americans in the area (Drayton 1802:92).

The Etiwan tribe that reportedly inhabited Daniel Island from 1609 to 1751 migrated inland to Moncks Corner (Dahlman and Dalman 2007:17-18; Waddell 2004: 256). In 1715, the Etiwan tribe consisted of only one village of two hundred forty in Goose Creek; the census recorded eighty men and one hundred sixty women and children (Heitzler 2012:61; Waddell 2004: 263). By 1750, the Etiwan tribe moved south of Ashley River, the geographic center of Cusabo summer camps (Edelson 2006:31; Waddell 2004: 256).

New scholarship reveals that Native Americans did not ‘disappear’ from the landscape. There is evidence of ‘Settlement Indians’ who melted into Euro-American society or identified as African American, (Steen and Barnes 2010:6, 8; e.g. Hicks and Tauckchiray 1999; Petersen 2009). Native Americans who
intermarried with Africans or their descendants were classified as mustees; those who intermarried with Europeans were classified as mulatto. As early as 1718, the term was recognized in wills and other legal documents that carried the phrase, “all my slaves, whether Negroes, Indian, Mustees, or Molattoes [sic]” (Wood 1974:99). In 1719, Native Americans of pure blood were not subject to taxation; however, those with mixed blood were taxed as African. Between 1790 and 1810, the designation of ‘free person of color’ included descendants of African Americans and Native Americans.

Today, near Goose Creek is Varnertown, distinct Native American community of descendants from the Etiwan, Catawba, Cherokee, Edisto, and other area tribes. Existing for over one hundred fifty years, the tribe traced its members to the following families: Broad, Burbage, Clark, Dangerfield, Driggers, Huff, Varner, and Williams (Wassamasaw Tribe of Varnertown Indians Website). The South Carolina General Assembly awarded Varnertown Indians state recognition in 2009 (SC Concurrent Resolution S.1015).

Little material evidence is left of early Native Americans except through archaeological recovery of projectile points, pottery and shell middens. However, their ancestors’ mark is remembered on the land in two distinct ways: fields and Native geographical names. First, ‘large Indian old fields,’ evidence of early Native agriculture, located on maps and plantation plats mark the past presence
of ‘settlement era’ Cusabo (Edelson 2006:33). Second, names used to describe many of the rivers associated with locations where Native Americans resided continue a Native ‘sense of geography’ (Drayton 1802:93; Edelson 2006:32-33). The English named the Santee River after the Santee tribe, which inhabited the middle area of the river. Originally, Cooper River, for example, was called Wando; and it was known variously as Etiwan, Ettewan, Ettiwan, Ittewan, Ittywn, Ittywan Itwan, and/or Ityone (Dahlman and Dalman 2007:19; Fraser 1989:160; Names 1954-1981:18; Neuffer 1983:25; Smith 1988c:26). Other Native geographic terms include Pee Dee, Sampit, Sewee, Kiawah, Bohicket, Edisto, Ashepoo, and Combahee (Edelson 2006:33).

In 1663, Charles II granted eight Lords Proprietors (hereafter Proprietors): Edward Hyde, First Earl of Clarendon (1609-1674); George Monck, First Duke of Albemarle (1608-1670); Lord William Craven, First Earl of Craven (1608-1697); Lord John, First Baron Berkley of Stratton (1602-1678); Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftsbury (1621-1683); Sir George Carteret (1610-1680); Sir William Berkley (1610-1680); and Sir John Colleton (1608-1666):

... all that province, territory or tract of land of ground ... within our dominions of America; ... which lieth [sic] ... within thirty-six degrees of the north latitude, and to the west, as far as the South Seas, and so ... within thirty-one degrees of north latitude... (Charter of Carolina, 1665)
to be called Carolina in his honor. Thus, under the Charter of Carolina, Charles Town was founded in 1670 (Drayton 1802:101).

In conjunction with creating Carolina, John Locke (1632-1704) provided the Lords Proprietors with a Constitution, which established a complicated social hierarchy that gave control to a new ‘landed aristocracy.’ Co-authored with Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper, one of the purposes of Locke’s Constitution was to prevent “erecting a numerous democracy” (Armitage 2004). English law prevented the Proprietors from granting titles, such as Earl or Baron, that were already in use in England. Therefore, Article 5 of the Constitution created new hereditary titles for the Carolina aristocracy: Cassique (junior) and Landgrave (senior). Locke chose the term Landgrave, which was in use in Germany, to denote those ranked just below the Proprietors; they were the chartered equivalent of a royal vassal. Landgraves, who were similar in ranking to a ‘Duke’ but above a ‘Count,’ had sovereign rights and decision-making powers. Cassiques, ranked below the Landgraves, considered of lesser nobility, and served as hereditary representatives in the proposed Upper House of the Carolina Assembly. Some scholars interchanged ‘cassique’ and ‘cacique’ when referring to this level of Lowcountry nobility. However, ‘cacique’ was the Spanish title for the leader of an indigenous group. For purposes of this dissertation, the term used is ‘cassique.’ Article 27 of the Constitution included
hereditary serfdom consisting of leetman under jurisdiction of the nobleman they served; this ranking failed to take hold in Carolina.

The Proprietors, as members of English nobility who served as the ruling landlords of Carolina, gave large land grants as rewards to English and Barbadian gentry, who in turn managed their landed estates like old-world feudal estates. According to the Constitution, members of the Carolina aristocracy were entitled to particular amounts of acreage in addition to a generous headright system of land distribution. Under the headright system, each family member received one hundred fifty acres. Indentured males received one hundred fifty acres after completion of their indenture. Slaveowners received one hundred fifty acres for each slave owned. Additionally, the Proprietors postponed quitrents (1/2 pence per acre per year tax) until 1689.

Article 3 of the Constitution divided Carolina into counties (one for each Proprietor) with eight signories each, eight baronies, and four precincts with six colonies in each precinct. Article 9 allotted four baronies to each Landgrave (one per county) and two baronies to each Cassique (two per county) (Edgar 2006:533; McCrady 1897:96-97). Baronies, consisting of twelve thousand acres, attached to the title and could not be sold from their line as stipulated by the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina (Smith 1910:75). The baronies served as the local nobility’s shares in the colony (Edgar 2006:533; McCrady 1897:95-96). The intent
of the baronies was to recreate an English feudal society where indentured servants worked manorial estates; instead, however, Landgraves and Cassiques became owners of large tracts of land worked at first by indentured servants and later by Native American and African slaves (Edgar 2006:533). These early settlers laid the foundation for a unique cultural landscape built upon a plantation system that served to develop large tracts of land under single ownership and predicated on an unequal dichotomous racial composition.

Two baronies emerged on the East Branch: Ashby Barony (map 2.7) and Cypress Barony (map 2.5). On April 25, 1681, Cassique John Ashby (1633-1699) received a grant of two thousand acres on the southernmost side of the East Branch “at a place the Indians call Yadhaw” (Smith 1917a, 1917b; Stoney 1932:166). Ashby Barony, also known as Quinby Barony, lay in the Parish of St. Thomas and St. Denis on the eastern side or bank of the East Branch (Stoney 1932:166). When Cassique John Ashby (1633-1699) died in England, his title and Ashby Barony devised to his son, Second Cassique John Ashby, Jr., who lived in Carolina (Smith 1917a:4-5).

Cassique John Ashby (1633-1699), a London merchant also known as ‘Johannes Ashby Londini Mercator,’ was a member of the Royal African Company of England with Proprietor Anthony Ashley Cooper (1621-1683), Proprietor William Earl of Craven (1608-1697), Proprietor Lord John Berkley
(1602-1678), Proprietor Sir George Carteret (1608-1666), and Sir Peter Colleton (Smith 1917a:3). The Royal African Company of England, royally chartered in 1672, succeeded The Company of Royal Adventurers Trading to Africa, which engaged in the international slave trade between West Africa and the West Indies (e.g. Davies 1957; McCartney 2003; Zook 1919:134-231). Under the royal monopoly, the Company transported an average of five thousand enslaved laborers per year between 1680 and 1686.

In 1681, Landgrave Thomas Colleton, the second son of Proprietor Sir John Colleton (1608-1666) and a prominent and wealthy planter-elite residing in Barbados, received, yet never took possession of a twelve thousand-acre grant known as Cypress Barony (map 2.5) at the headwaters of the East Branch in St. John’s Berkeley Parish (Miles 2004:41; Smith 1900:328-329). Upon his death, Cypress Barony descended to his son Peter Colleton, who also resided in Barbados. The southwestern corner of Cypress Barony was approximately two-tenths of a mile west of Quenby Creek (Huger’s Creek), the southeastern corner was about 4.2 miles east abutting Irishtown Plantation, the northeastern corner was inside Little Hell Hole Swamp, and the northwestern corner was about one thousand feet west of the upper reaches of Alligator Creek (Leland 1984).

On May 10, 1682, the Proprietors divided Carolina into three counties: Berkeley, Colleton, and Craven (Edgar 2006:67; Weir 1983:64; SC Records 1:130-
in 1686, Granville County was created. The primary function of the counties was the granting of land as well as administering justice and the election of representatives. The Church Act of 1706 established the Church of England in Carolina and, subsequently, created ten parishes (SC Statutes 2:283, 328-330). By 1716, parishes became election districts and dealt with local needs. In 1769, Carolina’s colonial General Assembly reorganized colonial counties into seven new judicial ‘districts’ with a court house and legislative members for each district (SC Public Laws: 268-269); Charles Town District was created from Berkeley and Colleton Counties. As the state entered nationhood, the General Assembly attempted to revamp election and voting precincts into the ‘county’ form of government. However, the Lowcountry counties refused to conform and the Districts of Beaufort, Charleston, and Georgetown persisted; on March 12, 1785, Berkeley County reappeared within Charleston District (SC Statutes 4:661-666; SC Acts 1797:144-145). Between 1786 and 1790, the Assembly continued to lay out counties in Beaufort, Charleston, and Georgetown Districts; however, these failed in the Lowcountry because the voting precincts of the parish system were well established. In fact, parish lines were so entrenched in the Lowcountry that local militia units organized along parish lines; yet, companies used very localized area names or the commanding officer’s name rather than parish names. In 1800, the entire state adopted the ‘county form’ of government, except
the Lowcountry who held strongly to their districts. Districts and parishes did not disappear until the 1868 state constitution declared that, “the Judicial Districts shall hereafter be designated as Counties” (Article 2 §3).

When originally created in 1682, Berkeley County included St. John Berkeley Parish, St. James Goose Creek Parish, St. James Santee Parish, St. Stephen Parish, and St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish. Over time, Berkeley County expanded and contracted. This study focuses on St. John’s Berkeley and St. Thomas and St. Denis Parishes.

In 1708, the original boundaries included Upper and Lower St. John’s Berkeley Parish (map 2.6):

To the North-East by the bounds of Craven County, to the South by the bounds of the bounds of the Parishes of St. Thomas and St. Dennis [sic], and by the Eastern branch of Cooper River, then down Cooper River to the Mouth of Back River, to the South-West, partly by the said Back River, to the plantation of David Durham inclusive, and partly by a North-West line from the West part of the said Durham’s plantation, to the North-East bounds of Berkley County, and to the North-East by the bounds of the said County (Cross 1985; Dalcho 1820:264).

On September 22, 1733, St. John’s Berkeley Parish gained acreage from non-parish lands bounding inland from the county line (SC Statute 3:370, No. 564 §2). On March 5, 1737, St. John’s Berkeley Parish lost acreage to St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish (SC Public Laws No. 654 §3:150).
St. Thomas and St. Denis Parishes were located on the peninsula formed by the Cooper and Wando Rivers (Edgar 2006:830). Dalcho (1820:287) stated that in “an Act, [dated] March 6, 1736/7, that the Parishes of St. Thomas and St. Dennis [sic] ‘were bounded by the most northerly branch of the said Eastern branch of Cooper River’.” The original boundaries of St. Thomas Parish, as laid off in 1706, were:

To the N. E. by the Bounds of Craven County; to the South by the bounds of Christ Church Parish and Wando River; to the West by Cooper River, to that tract of land, commonly called the Hagin, inclusive, and to the North by the Eastern branch of the said Cooper River, to the Plantation of the Right Hon. Sir Nathaniel Johnson, Knight, Governor, exclusive, and then, by an East line from the northernmost Part of the said Plantation to the bounds of Craven County. (Converse 2011:16; Orvin 1973:3; as written in Dalcho 1820: 284)

In the 1706 Church Act, a parish organized “in the Orange Quarter for the use of the French Settlement there which shall be called by the name of the parish of St. Dennis [sic]” (Smith 1917b:115) “in ye middle of” of St. Thomas Parish (Edgar 2006:830). The original Orange Quarter boundaries were:

Cassique John Ashby bounds the Quarter on the north; other settlements beyond the headwaters of the creek on the east; the English on the Cooper River on the south; and the Eastern Branch of the Cooper River on the west. (Smith 1917b:116).

A 1708 Act outlined St. Denis as:
...lying in the midst of the bounds, and designed at the present only for the use of the French settlement which, at present, are mixed with the English, be it therefore further enacted, ... that the French congregation of the church of St. Denis only shall be liable to the charges and parochial duties belonging to the said church during the time that the divine service of the said congregation be in the French language, and that for the future, when the service shall be performed in the English language, the said church of St. Denis shall become a chapel of ease to the said parish church of St. Thomas. (Converse 2011:18; Orvin 1973:3)

Later, on December 18, 1708, the Assembly combined the two parishes and enacted the following,

Whereas by the above-mentioned Limits and Bounds of the several Parishes of St. Thomas and St. Dennis [sic], the said Parish of St. Dennis [sic] is included in the said Bounds, and it will be difficult at present to fix the Bounds of the said Parish of St. Dennis [sic], lying in the midst of the Bounds, and designed at the present, are mixed with English (Dalcho 1820:288).

By 1715, the name ‘French’ superseded ‘Orange’ as demonstrated by Herman Moll’s map, which identified “St. Thomas with y‘ French Settlement at Orange Quarter called St. Denis” (Smith 1917b:116). Moll’s map of Carolina (map 2.7) was based on John Crisp’s “A Compleat Description of the Province of Carolina (London, 1711), which was based on surveys conducted by Maurice Mathews and John Love. By 1784, St. Thomas and St. Denis officially became one parish because of intermarriage among the residents (Converse 2011:24-25; Dalcho 1820:292; Edgar 2006:830).
Reconstructing accurate population numbers for Carolina, in general, or the East Branch, in particular, during the Colonial and Early Republic Periods is difficult; however, by combining evidence from several sources a generalized quantitative analysis offers a glimpse into a complex society (Tables 2.2-2.4). From the initiation of settlement, Carolina was a ‘polycultural’ society of various ethnic groups of Native Americans, Africans, and Europeans (c.f. Brown 2012; Gomez 1998). While Brown applied the term ‘polycultural’ to argue that Lowcountry Africans represented a diversity of African-descended people from various West-Central and West African societies, an argument can be made that each community in the formative years were, indeed, ‘polycultural’. For all intents and purposes, within a few generations, each group would be subsumed under generalized categories: Native American tribes as ‘Indian’, Europeans as White, and Africans as Black. Expanding upon the concept a step further, eventually, through close contact, intermarriage, and cultural exchange, a distinctive ‘polycultural’ Lowcountry mentalité emerged. A detailed discussion of the emergence of the Lowcountry planter-elite mentalité and the Lowcountry Gullah community, which informed plantation social order, appears in chapter three. Therefore, by the early nineteenth century, a complex classification system emerged that included indentured servants, enslaved Native American and African slaves and their descendants, mulattoes (Europeans mixed with either
Native Americans or Africans), mustees (Africans mixed with Native Americans), and Europeans. After 1790, another group emerged: ‘yellowish,’ that was composed of mixed African, European, and Native American descendants.

Before analyzing Carolina’s demography, a few comments about sources is necessary. Population numbers were taken from sources that either analyzed or relied upon other sources. For the years from 1670 to 1800, John Drayton (1802) offered general estimations that included population data from the 1792 and 1800 federal censuses. Additionally, Drayton included population information from a 1734 memorial, signed by the Governor and other officials to the king, which stated the number of men available for the militia and declared that the number of slaves was at least twenty-two thousand “in a proportion of three to one for all white inhabitants in South-Carolina [sic]” (Drayton 1802:102).

Ras Michael Brown (2012), for instance, provided estimates of Lowcountry enslaved populations from 1670 to 1750; his estimates were incorporated to represent the Native American and African slaves, as well as Europeans in the tables for each phase. Brown relied upon documentation from Russell R. Menard (1987:104) and Philip D. Morgan (1998:61). An important source for annual slave importation numbers is the Voyages Database (http://slavevoyages.org/tast/database/search.faces?yearFrom=1754&yearTo=1775&mjslptimp=21300).
In analyzing population trends, it was useful to divide the period under discussion into three separate periods: two for the Colonial period and one for the Early Republic period. The Colonial period was divided into a ‘frontier’ phase (1670s-1720s) represented in tables 2.2-2.3, and into a ‘plantation’ phase (1730s-1780s) represented in table 2.4 (Berlin 2000:142-176; Brown 2012: 34, 54; for details on the frontier thesis, c.f. Frederick Jackson Turner). Each phase had its own characteristics that were highly sensitive to settlement patterns, enslavement, natural increase, and migration.

Despite the claim that Barbadians replanted their established plantation system in Carolina, the ‘frontier’ phase was hardly a ‘plantation society’ but rather a small community of immigrants, European and enslaved African, who depended upon the native population for survival (Berlin 2000; Wood 1974). Within a decade, however, population stabilized quickly and in 1690 Carolina was demographically on its way to creating the ‘plantation society’ and the Black majority in the early nineteenth century. The advent of rice as a stable export crop shifted the colony from the ‘frontier’ phase where settlers, indentured servants and slaves worked side by side to the ‘plantation’ phase characterized by an extensive importation of African slaves to work the agricultural landscape (Berlin 2000:142-76). Brown (2012:55) commented that, “the plantation landscape and its social circumstances took shape in the seventeenth century well before...
rice cultivation.” Brown added that rice cultivation “hardened the existing plantation regime ... already well established by the 1690s.”

During the Colonial period, from the late-seventeenth century to the mid-eighteenth century, the original cultural hearth had concentrated along the Ashley, Cooper, and Stono Rivers. Europeans and African slaves found themselves in the minority in a land controlled and dominated by various Native American tribes. Unfortunately, accurate documentation of Native American population in Carolina was not a priority in the dominant narrative of Carolina’s founding. Therefore, the record offers conflicting statistics; as previously mentioned, Drayton estimated the Native population from thirty to forty thousand at the founding of the colony, while Swanton’s more conservative estimate was fifteen thousand. A possible explanation for the wide discrepancy could be due to the fact that Drayton’s estimation may have included lands that eventually became South Carolina in the early nineteenth century and Swanton’s estimation may have only included the area considered the colony in the late seventeenth century. Both estimations revealed that the colonists and their few enslaved laborers were overwhelmingly outnumbered.

Carolina began as a small humble colony of one hundred seventy white immigrants and thirty African slaves, brought in small groups of one or two, representing a ratio of 6:1 (table 2.2). During the next decade, the population
ratio remained steady at 5:1; the white population increased by eighty-three percent to one thousand whites and the slave population increased by eighty-five percent to two hundred. Beginning in 1690, the Lowcountry began a period of increased Africanization as slave imports shifted from the Caribbean to Africa; the African slave population, increasingly composed of men, women, and children, rose by eighty-seven percent to fifteen hundred and, for the first time, Native American slaves, overwhelmingly women, entered the record in low numbers (one hundred). In 1710, the enslaved population outnumbered the white population for the first time by almost 2:1. The recorded number of Native American slaves rose steadily that by the time the Crown assumed control of the colony in 1720 Governor James Moore, Jr. reported their numbers at two thousand, an all-time high but merely less than ten percent of the total population. At the same time, the white population rose only by fifty-eight percent to over sixty-five hundred (Wood 1974:145-147).

By 1705, population increased to three hundred fifteen whites and one hundred eighty slaves, a ratio of 1.75:1, in St. John’s Berkeley Parish (Brown 2012:56; Terry 1981:116). Population growth in St. John’s Berkeley Parish represented a one hundred six percent and six hundred percent rate in the number of whites and blacks, respectively, in just one parish when compared to the total population of the colony just thirty-five years earlier. Peter Wood
(1974:147) provided calculations for the 1720 enslaved population in St. John’s Berkeley Parish and St. Thomas & St. Denis Parish; the enslaved population was 1,439 (seventy-five percent) and 943 (sixty-three percent), respectively (cited in Brown 2012:56; Terry 1981:116). Extrapolation of these figures provided a total population of 1,919 for St. John’s Berkeley Parish and 1,497 for St. Thomas & St. Denis Parish. Between 1705 and 1720, the total population in St. John’s Berkeley Parish rose by seventy-two percent or one thousand three hundred eighty-nine, numerically; however, the white population increased by only twenty-seven percent or one hundred thirty, numerically, and the enslaved population increased by an astonishingly eighty-seven percent, or one thousand two hundred fifty-nine, numerically. The enslaved population outnumbered the dominant population by a 3:1 ratio. At the close of the ‘frontier’ phase, pioneer families stabilized and began natural increase, African slave importations intensified, and the plantation core flourished.

Several events in the 1730s affected Carolina’s population as the Lowcountry entered the ‘plantation’ phase. Prime riverfront lands along Ashley, Cooper, Stono, and Wando Rivers had filled quickly; therefore, the lack of riverfront land for rice cultivation necessitated expansion beyond the plantation core into new frontier zones: between Santee and the Edisto Rivers, Port Royal to the south, and Winyah Bay to the north (Brown 2012:58-59; Edelson 2006).
Although Carolina separated in 1712 into North and South, lands on the west side of Cape Fear in North Carolina became a destination for out-migration in the 1730s. For example, Maurice Moore (1683-1743), second son of colonial Carolina Governor (1700-1703) James Moore (1640-1706), an Irishman from Barbados and Elizabeth Berringer (1660-1720), step-daughter of Sir John Yeamans, Landgrave and Governor, was born in Goose Creek Parish (Jones 1913); after aiding in the successful end of both the Tuscarora and Yemassee Wars, Maurice Moore (1683-1743) remained in North Carolina. Between 1725 and 1734, Moore (1683-1743) encouraged South Carolinians to settle the seven thousand acres he had acquired in the Albemarle region on Towne Creek below Wilmington and later, in 1725 he established the first permanent settlement in the region, Brunswick, named in honor of the royal family (Church History 1892; London). James Moore, first son of Governor James Moore (1640-1706), became Governor of South Carolina (1719-1721) during the royal period.

As early as 1732, Carolina planter-elites extended their property holdings and slaves into Georgia; essentially by 1742, planter-elites and slaves from South Carolina began recreating their slave-based rice plantation economy in Georgia’s Lowcountry along Altamaha, Ogeechee, Savannah, and Satilla Rivers (Wood 1984, 2014). For example, Henry Laurens, merchant and planter-elite at Mepkin Plantation on the West Branch of Cooper River, planted in the Altamaha River
with Scotsman Lachlan McIntosh (1727-1806), whom Laurens had employed at the age of twenty-one-year-old in Charles Town in 1748; Laurens was instrumental in Georgia’s independence movement (Sullivan 2014). Between 1735 and 1750, Georgia prohibited slavery as a matter of policy, which was a desire for profitability based on European workers rather than enslaved laborers (Wood 2014).

The most significant population change in the 1730s was the Africanization of the Lowcountry. In 1737, Samuel Dyssli, a Swiss visitor to the Lowcountry, commented in a letter that, “Carolina looks more like a negro country than like a country settled by white people” (Wood 1974:132). As Lowcountry-born African descendants grew in large numbers, fewer Africans, in comparison, were imported into Carolina (Brown 2012: 22). One reason was fear of insurrection by the black majority; for instance, as a result of the 1739 Stono Uprising, a heavy prohibitive duty was placed on slave imports that lasted until 1744, which dropped imports to a fraction of previous decades. By the end of the third decade of the eighteenth century, Carolina’s African enslaved population had increased ninety-six percent in five decades from fifteen hundred to thirty-nine thousand persons (table 2.3).

The Lowcountry’s population continued to shift into the 1750s. Settlers looking for new lands moved into Carolina’s backcountry; as small farmers,
these settlers owned few enslaved laborers, if any at all. For example, as late as 1770, only six thousand or eight percent of the colony’s seventy-six thousand enslaved laborers lived in the backcountry, while thirty thousand or sixty-one percent of the colony’s free white population lived in the same region (Coclanis 1989:75).

The Revolutionary War not only disrupted enslaved laborer importations but also accounted for losses in the existing enslaved laborer population. Many enslaved laborers took the opportunity to escape, rebel, or flee with the British; American and British forces conscripted other enslaved laborers. Planters felt the need to recoup their losses in crop (neglected during the war) and laborers; during the late 1780s, planter-elites increased their labor force, through importations, to pre-war numbers. For the first federal census taken in 1790, Berkeley County reported approximately 30,000 whites and 103,000 blacks and by the third federal census taken in 1820, the county was overwhelmingly black with a ratio of 2:1 (Edgar 2006:68). The 1790 federal census enumerated only the heads of families. South Carolina failed to meet the October 27, 1791 deadline set by Congress and received an eighteen-month extension; therefore, the first federal census for South Carolina was actually dated in 1792. Charleston was enumerated as the fourth largest city in the nation behind New York City,
Philadelphia, and Boston. For the next two federal censuses, Charleston ranked fifth, surpassed by Baltimore.

Conclusion

As detailed in this chapter, the Ashley, Cooper, and Stono Rivers represented the original plantation core of river settlements in the Carolina Lowcountry. As settlement increased, the landscape was redefined and reshaped in ways that would forever affect the ways people perceived and interacted with the natural landscape. The prime motivation for European settlers was to acquire land and enslaved laborers that led to an Africanization of the Lowcountry. In general, therefore, it seems that to understand how people viewed their place on the landscape, it is useful to examine how and why particular settlement patterns developed. Scholars have studied individual plantations in the Lowcountry; however, with the exception of Goose Creek, few other Cooper River plantation communities have been adequately explored until now. Further research should be done to investigate how plantation communities took shape and developed social networks. This dissertation can serve as a base for future studies of plantation landscapes. However, caution must be applied, as the model presented in this dissertation might not be transferable to all situations. An implication of this chapter is that both the natural and cultural landscape should
be taken into account when examining the ways in which planter-elites constructed their landscape and how the enslaved perceived the same landscape.

In this chapter, I indicate that the natural landscape influenced the settlement patterns of the plantation landscape and ultimately played a significant role in shaping perceptions of the Lowcountry, in general, and the East Branch as a community. In the next two chapters, I examine in more depth the East Branch plantations to understand their relationships to each other and the land they inhabited. Chapter three focuses on the people, while chapter four focuses on the development of individual plantations.
### Table 2.1 Cusabo Tribes in South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Sub-Tribe</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Etiwan</td>
<td>Wando River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wando</td>
<td>Cooper River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiawa</td>
<td>Lower Ashley River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stono</td>
<td>Stono Entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Edisto</td>
<td>Edisto River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashepoo</td>
<td>Lower River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combahee</td>
<td>Lower Combahee River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wimbee</td>
<td>Lower Coosawhatchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escamaçu</td>
<td>Between St. Helena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sound and Broad River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 Estimated Frontier Phase Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Indian Slaves</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black Slaves</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Colony</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>(5500)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>5900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td><em>St. Johns Berkeley Parish</em></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>4080</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>9580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>6525</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11828</td>
<td>20353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td><em>St. Johns Berkeley Parish</em></td>
<td>485</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>St. Thomas &amp; St. Denis Parish</em></td>
<td>565</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>(14000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(14000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>(14000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(18000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(32000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td><em>St. Johns Berkeley</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Brown 2012; Drayton 1802 (in parenthesis); Wood 1974
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Indian Slaves</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>(South) Carolina</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22700</td>
<td>33200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>(South) Carolina</td>
<td>(7333)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(22000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(27333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>(South) Carolina</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39000</td>
<td>54000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>St. Johns Berkeley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>(South) Carolina</td>
<td>18200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>58200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>(South) Carolina</td>
<td>(40000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(90000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(130000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Brown 2012; Drayton 1802 (in parenthesis)
Table 2.4 Estimated Early Republic Phase Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White Male</th>
<th>White Female</th>
<th>Other Free</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10 10-16 16-26 26-45 &gt;4</td>
<td>&lt;10 10-16 16-26 26-45 &gt;4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>140178</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>108895</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>249073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>St. Johns Berkley</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>152* 209*</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- 331* -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5170 5922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>67* 145*</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- 185* -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3405 3836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>196255</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149336</td>
<td>146151 345591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>St. Johns Berkeley</td>
<td>- 101</td>
<td>47 56 108 38 103</td>
<td>47 47 81 33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6479 7193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>- 42</td>
<td>10 16 41 10 22</td>
<td>12 15 19 20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2328 2554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* age 16 and above; + under age 16; # all ages
Sources: Drayton 1802; 1792 State Census; 1800 State Census
Figure 2.1 Coastal Plain shown in purple (SCDNR)
Figure 2.2 Santee Cooper River Basin (Conrads and Smith 1996:6)
Figure 2.3 East Branch Watershed (South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control)
Figure 2.4 Southeastern Native Americans with inset of Cooper River (Waddell, 1980)
Map 2.2 St. John’s Parish c. 1750
Map 2.3 “A New and Exact Map of the Dominions of the King of Great Britain on ye Continent of North America Containing Newfoundland, New Scotland, New England, New York, New Jersey, Pensilvania [sic], Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina. According to the Newest and Most Exact Observations by Herman Moll Geographer,” 1731, depicting the lower center inset of “Map of the Improved Parts of Carolina” inset with close up of East Branch (American Memory, Library of Congress)
CHAPTER THREE
THE EAST BRANCH PEOPLE

Carolina’s elite based their ideology on English cultural models. One of these models, as incorporated in the Fundamental Constitution, was a variation of England’s three orders of society: royalty, nobility, and commoners; by the 1740s and 1750s, Carolina established its own distinctive order: elites, commoners, and enslaved laborers (Rogers et al. 1980:102). Lowcountry elites established themselves as the ruling class in a society that was rigidly hierarchical and restricted upward mobility. As part of their landed-gentry ideology and fixed by law, planter-elites maintained status and hierarchy with the planter-elite on top and the enslaved Africans and African Americans at the bottom.

By the mid-eighteenth-century merchant-elites, planter-elites, lawyers, and physicians constituted the gentry. Over time, the status of the trade profession remained high as the status of the legal profession declined and the status of physicians was even lower (Waterhouse 2005:136). By the late eighteenth century, however, planter-elites considered merchant-elites as belonging to a rank decidedly below their own (McInnis 2005:25). The fluid
structure of an earlier century transformed into a rigid elite class bounded by common ancestry, inherited wealth, and social status. Within this Lowcountry aristocracy, large sums of wealth were concentrated in the hands of a few.

Before the Revolutionary War, the South Carolina Lowcountry was by far the wealthiest area in British North America; Carolina planter-elites were the richest and largest group of elites. Wealth was at the heart of the colony’s cultural ethos. At the end of the eighteenth century, the Carolina Lowcountry elite were aristocratic, slave owning, and affluent; chiefly, they associated among themselves, were immensely rich, and felt immensely secure.

Recent developments in the fields of history and historical archaeology have led to a renewed interest in Lowcountry planter-elite and enslaved laborer relations, not from the viewpoint of power and resistance but rather from the viewpoint of kinship and community (Brown 2012; Glover 2000; Joseph and Zierden 2002; Kaye 2007). So far, however, there is little discussion about understanding how the identity of each group informed their perceptions of the landscape. This chapter seeks to remedy this gap by discussing the origins of the planter-elite mentalité and the origins of Gullah culture, in general, and how both were manifested in the East Branch community, in particular.

The first part of this chapter provides a brief overview of Lowcountry planter-elite culture. Drawing from the concept of the ‘open’ and ‘closed’ city,
there is some evidence that the planter-elites on the East Branch, as a cohesive community, followed a similar trajectory in their development. George C. Rogers, Jr. (1980) suggested that until the 1800s, Charleston was an ‘open city,’ one in which newcomers were absorbed into the ranks of the developing gentry. As an ‘open’ city, Charlestonians, particularly the elite, soaked up education, culture, and science from all over the world, especially from England. Charlestonians chose from the very best and founded a social order that was admired throughout the Atlantic world. Rogers suggested, however, that in 1808, Charleston became a ‘closed city,’ one in which there was no longer room for upward mobility. Next, the evidence presented in this chapter suggests that the East Branch community was a microcosm of Charleston and by extension the Lowcountry; therefore, the argument is made that the East Branch was at one time ‘open’ but ‘closed’ quickly. The bulk of this chapter is devoted to examining the various communities living together at the East Branch: the planter-elite, mixed-race elites, mulattoes, Africans, and African Americans. Finally, the last part of this chapter examines the effects of the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy upon the residents of the East Branch.

**Planter-elite English Ideology**

Using the disciplines of anthropology, history, and art history, Maurie D. McInnis presented a material culture study of Antebellum Charleston; her
primary goal was “to understand what the buildings and artifacts meant to the people who built them, used them, and lived among them” (2005:13). McInnis argued that the Lowcountry elite social hierarchy based its identification on English culture. Drawing upon Roger’s concept of a ‘closed city,’ McInnis argued that not only did Charleston transform into the most “ordered, controlled, and compartmentalized” city by 1860 but also that planter-elites had closed their ranks to end any notions of upward social mobility from the middle class (2005:19). To the contrary, Rogers argued that Charleston did not form a middle class; yet, Emma Hart (2010) presented a study on the emergence of a middle class between 1740 and the Revolution (c.f. Fraser 1993). This was definitely true for the East Branch; however, by the third generation, the East Branch elites, as members of the landholding and slaveholding class, closed ranks among themselves. Together the works of both Rogers, writing about the Colonial Period, and McInnis, writing about the Antebellum Period, informed this study of the East Branch planter-elite during the Early Republic Period (c.f. Bowes 1942; Glover 2000; Joseph and Zierden 2002; Waterhouse 2005).

Carolina’s eighteenth-century elite derived their ideology from English cultural models. They deeply admired the British constitution and maintained that they possessed the natural rights of Englishmen. According to Richard Waterhouse (2005:88), “the more English they became, the more [they] insisted
upon their rights as Englishmen.” The cultural ties of Carolina’s Lowcountry elites and England’s aristocracy were extremely close by the time of the American Revolution.

The aristocratic ideal was, and remains in the twenty-first century, part of the Lowcountry elite culture (Edgar 2006:533-34). With their preference for English tastes and standards, wealthy planter-elites and merchant-elites closely resembled the English gentry (Waterhouse 2005:68). For example, William Henry Drayton declared in 1774, “[T]his colony was settled by English subjects - by people from England herself. A people who brought over with them ... the invaluable rights of Englishmen” (Waterhouse 2005:113). Further, to illustrate their ‘Englishness,’ Edmund L. Drago stated that these ‘British’ aristocrats wore hoods, neck cloths, and other clothing to “keep their complexions as white as possible, in contrast to their black-skinned slaves and red-necked servants” (1990:23). Englishman Lord Adam Gordon stated “that, the South Carolinians were more attached to the Mother Country than any other mainland British colony” (Waterhouse 2005:85).

Scholars have examined why Lowcountry elites based their lifestyles on the ‘culture’ of the English gentry (McInnis 2005:17-30: Rogers 1980:89-115; Waterhouse 2005:67-88). Several factors account for their ‘Englishness.’ First, the core of the Lowcountry descendants was from the English gentry. As stated in
Chapter two, early immigrants predominantly came from England and English-Caribbean colonies such as Barbados, Bermuda, the Bahamas, and Jamaica. According to Drago (1990), Charleston and the surrounding Lowcountry maintained an aristocratic ethos reinforced by English planter-elites coming from Barbados, also known as ‘Little England.’

Second, trade ties between England and Charles Town were close and direct. Between 1730 and 1820, Charleston was the western edge of the British Atlantic highway (Rogers 1980:3-4). For example, until the late 1740s, John Nickleson and brothers Richard and Thomas Shubrick, residents on the East Branch, operated under the partnership of Nickleson and Shubrick. Nickleson and Richard Shubrick returned to England after making a fortune, as was customary at the time; thus, merchants who worked both sides of the Atlantic had a decided advantage in commerce (Rogers 1980:14). As English merchants settled in Charles Town, they eventually developed into wealthy merchant-elites who controlled both sides of the trade industry: shipping crops to England and Europe and receiving much-needed English manufactured goods in the colony.

Members of the merchant class were importers not only of goods but also of enslaved laborers. Liverpool and London dominated the African slave trade and Charles Town merchants served as factors for the profitable business (Edgar 1998:63). Wealthy merchant-elite turned planter-elite Henry Laurens (1724-1792)
learned the mercantile business in London (c.f. Edelson 2006:200-254). In 1749, Laurens, subsequent owner of Mepkin Plantation and son-in-law of Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) of Comingtee Plantation, formed a partnership with his brother-in-law George Austin; the firm of Austin and Laurens was one of the leading importers of Africans (Edgar 2006:538-540; Glover 2000:89, 91, 97; Rogers et al.1980:38, 54). In 1790, the three largest slaveowners in the East Branch community, in descending order, were Henry Laurens with two hundred ninety-eight enslaved laborers, Elias Ball III (1752-1810) with two hundred fourteen enslaved laborers, John Ball (1760-1817) with one hundred eighty-eight enslaved laborers, Robert Quash (1740-1811) with one hundred fifty-five; and Archibald Broün (1752-1797) with one hundred fifty (1790 Census). After 1790, planter-elites began to look down upon those in the slave trade but not before three generations, between 1730 and 1808, had produced massive fortunes (Rogers 1980:52).

Third, the Church of England (Anglican) was established firmly in Carolina. Although Carolina was a religious-tolerant colony, Beck (2002:163) suggested that immigrants’ desire to maintain their ‘Englishness’ led them to remain loyal to their King and Church. Additionally, political leaders such as Governor James Moore, Jr. and Sir Nathaniel Johnson, were staunch supporters of the Anglican Church. Johnson, for example, was responsible for the
establishment of the 1706 Church Act that not only established the Anglican Church as the colony’s official church but also established the politically powerful parish system (Beck 2002:164; Edgar 1998:92-94). All of these factors remained central and strong in Carolina elite mentalité until the advent of the American Revolution and its resultant cultural break with England.

The eighteenth-century elite ideal was to be a Lowcountry landed gentleman; these gentlemen were one of two very wealthy types: planters and merchants. Retiring merchant-elites, who aspired to become gentleman-planters, invested in coastal vessels and country stores; planter-elites invested their surplus capital and land in enslaved laborers. For instance, in 1709, Barbadian merchant Michael Mahon arrived in Carolina and described himself as a merchant; however, by 1713, he called himself a planter (Lees 1980:64; Waterhouse 2005:30, 148).

Young men were trained in the social graces, customs, and accomplishments of an English gentleman. An English education reinforced close cultural ties with England and planter-elites consolidated their family’s social standing by educating their sons as physicians or lawyers at Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, and the Inns of Court (Fraser 1993:26-27; McInnis 2005:5; Waterhouse 2005:67-72, 137). Not all sons were educated in England; for example, Daniel Elliott Huger (1779-1854), who was born at Limerick Plantation, studied law at
the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University) (Dictionary of American Biography). Other prestigious and influential East Branch families that produced leading lawyers included the Pinckneys, Rutledges, and Manigaults (Fraser 1993:27; Waterhouse 2005:136).

**East Branch ‘First’ Families**

The planter-elites and merchant-elites were a closely-knit group in Lowcountry society as they were in other colonial societies, such as Virginia (Rogers 1980:23-24; c.f. Glover 2000). By the mid-eighteenth century, business and marriage ties became highly important as evidenced by the number of marriages between merchant-elite and planter-elite families. David Hackett Fischer (1989) pointed out that the American elite married their cousins to preserve family holdings. In 1780, John Ball (1760-1817) of Kensington married his first cousin, Jane Ball (1761-1804) of Hyde Park (Deas 1909:96; Stoney 1932:172). In 1804, Elias Ball persuaded his nephew John Ball Jr. (1782-1834), the youngest son of John Ball (1760-1817) and Lydia Child Chicken Ball, to marry his cousin, Elizabeth Bryan (1784-1812); upon their marriage, Elias Ball settled them at Comingtee Plantation (Eastman 2011:114). The significance of these marriages in the East Branch community is examined in chapter four.

John Beaufain Irving (1842) was the first person to identify the East Branch as a cohesive area. Some of the oldest and most well-to-do ‘first’ families in the
Lowcountry were entrenched in the early settlements along the Cooper River. A principal settlement was at St. James, Goose Creek (hereafter Goose Creek), on a tributary of the Cooper River. However, equally important as an early settlement was the East Branch of the Cooper River. The close proximity of two wealthy parishes, lower St. Johns Berkeley and St. Thomas and St. Denis, enabled the formation of a distinct community interconnected through ties of blood or marriage. The East Branch community began as a polycultural community: English from England and the West Indies, French Huguenots, Scots, Irish and Africans (c.f. Edelson 2006; Glover 2000; Joseph and Zierden 2002). Between 1698 and 1842, six generations settled along the East Branch.

Among the ‘first’ families to arrive before 1700 in St. Johns Berkeley were the Ball, Broughton, Cordes, Harleston, Keith, LeJau, and Ravenel families who were primarily concerned with accumulating material wealth. Not only did these ‘first’ families become the core of the East Branch but they also become the core of Carolina’s emerging prominent planter-elite families that were bound together by marriages.

The East Branch ‘first’ families can be divided into three groups. The first group consisted of English immigrants, primarily from England and Barbados, who arrived during the seventeenth century. The Barbadian immigrants were retired merchant-elites, middling planters, or their younger sons who became
very influential politicians and gentleman-planter, held large land grants and made enormous profits from rice and indigo. Several East Branch families intermarried with Goose Creek families. Goose Creek Barbadians included Colonel James Moore, Arthur and Edward Middleton, Benjamin Schenckingh, Robert Gibbs, Ralph Izard, Captain George Chicken, and Thomas Smith, son of Landgrave Smith (Heitzler 2005; Waterhouse 2005:28-30). These ‘Goose Creek’ men shaped public life and politics in the first generation of colonization; Edward Middleton was one of the most influential men of early Carolina (Glover 2000:4-5; Heitzler 2005:39).

The inter-related Ball and Harleston families, from England, settled in St. Johns Berkeley Parish (Ball 1998; Glover 2000:7). The Harlestons, a seventeenth-century family of means from England, had suffered losses when the English Civil War ravaged their properties in Cheshire. Charles and Affra Harleston, brother and sister, sailed for Carolina to re-make a fortune; Charles Harleston, however, did not stay and left for Barbados. In 1708, another brother, John Harleston, along with his sister Elizabeth, followed the siblings to Carolina.

The second group primarily consisted of French Huguenots and a few Scots and Irish who purchased large rice and indigo estates. Most were merchants and artisans who settled in St. James, Goose Creek and St. Johns Berkeley parishes (Heitzler 2005). From Scotland, John and David Deas settled in

As early as the 1680s, French Huguenots migrated to South Carolina (Rogers 1980:5; Shlasko 2002:138; Steen 2002:146); Huguenots established communities at Goose Creek, French Santee, and the French Quarter on the East Branch (Heitzler 2005:41-43; Miles 2004:64). By the beginning of the eighteenth century, about five hundred Huguenots came to Carolina; Huguenots were attracted by cheap land, commercial opportunities, and most importantly, religious freedom (Glover 2000:7; Miles 2004:13, 53-54, 64). Among the settlers in French Santee near Jamestown were the Gaillard, Gendron, Horry, Huger, Jerman, Manigault, and Ravenel families; the Horry, Huger, and Manigault families either owned plantations on the East Branch or inter-married with East Branch families. The immigrant French Huguenot Simons family settled at the French Quarter (Rogers 1980:5).

The Huguenots experienced rapid and complete Anglicization in Carolina. By the 1730s and 1740s, after the first wave of settlement, second
generation Huguenots had abandoned their French language and had intermarried with the British families (Edgar 2006:460-66; Shlasko 2002:118; Steen 2002:146; c.f. Hirsch 1928). In her examination of the French Huguenot community at French Santee, Ellen Shlasko (2002) identified several factors which led to their rapid assimilation during the eighteenth century. One factor was a political backlash against the French led to the passage of laws that stripped them of political power and autonomy (2002:138). Another factor was the increasing African population; during the eighteenth century, ethnic laws among whites blurred as the English encouraged a unified white identity to counter the growing black population. Finally, by the third generation, most French Huguenots had intermarried with the English community. Despite assimilation, Shlasko (2002:138) argued that the Huguenot culture “became part of the emerging culture” of Carolina. Historical archaeologist Carl Steen (2002:145-146) argued that beginning in 1763, a similar process of assimilation occurred among the second wave of French immigration at the township of New Bordeaux. Steen offered an additional factor for the loss of cultural identity among the New Bordeaux French; English law prohibited direct trade with France, which resulted in a lack of available French goods (Steen 2002:154). In every French community, there was evidence that French settlers Anglicized their names; for example, Jean became John, Pierre became Peter, and Antoine
became Anthony (Steen 2002:157). Each of these factors, as identified by Shlasko and Steen, were evident in assimilation among the French Huguenots in the East Branch community. Despite evidence of total assimilation, Shlasko’s recent re-examination of French culture provides evidence that French Huguenot identity remained strong in the face of anti-French backlash. She argues that memorials and monuments erected by Huguenot descendants serve as links to a strong sense of Huguenot community that developed among Charleston’s French merchant class (Shlasko 2011:17-28).

The third group consisted of eighteenth-century immigrants from England, France, and northern American cities, who were initially professionals or merchants that later became planter-elites. For instance, the Laurens family came by way of New York (Rogers 1980:5). Members of this group gained distinction through public office and/or through service in the Revolutionary War.

Eventually the East Branch planter-elites consisted of large numbers of branches from a comparatively small number of ‘first’ families. The importance of these complex kinship networks becomes evident in the formation and maintenance of elite power within the landscape (q.v. chapter four). For example, the Ball family, who owned prosperous East Branch plantations, established elaborate kinship networks.
Mixed Race Elites

Not all who came to the East Branch became successful planter-elites. Since 1975, Bruce L. Mouser has been researching and writing about the unique characteristics of more than seventy European-African slave-trading families in the Rio Pongo region of West Africa (modern-day Guinea) between 1750 and 1850 (Mouser 1975, 1996, 2000; 2007; 2016; c.f. 2016:36 for a list of surnames). According to Mouser, these European Africans self-identified as separate from the majority in Africa, as well as in their home communities in Liverpool, England; Charles Town, South Carolina; Havana, Cuba; and Boston, Massachusetts (Mouser 2016:21-39). Charleston-based slavers who maintained dual residence in Africa included David Botefeur, George Cooke, John Fraser, Zebulon Miller, Stiles Edward Lightbourn, and Paul Fraser (Mouser 2013:16; Sparks 2016:70). This separateness not only denied European-Africans ethnic membership but also denied them a path to white elite membership. Further, intermarriage within their own community increased their self-identity and separateness. This next section focuses on slave trader John Holman, his African family, and their influence in the East Branch community.

John Holman Sr. (1740-1792), a wealthy English slave trader on the Rio Pongo (located in modern day Guinea) whose principle wife was an African (possibly mixed with European) woman named Elizabeth, traded with Henry
Laurens (1724-1792) as part of his slave trading business (Lowther 2011:7, 65; Mouser 2016:31; Sparks 2016:65). It should be noted that Henry Laurens left the slave trading business in 1767 for humanitarian reasons (Sparks 2016:58); however, he continued assisting others in the trade. For example, a September 8, 1770 letter to Holman Sr. recorded their business relationship, wherein Laurens stated:

[i]f you send any Slaves to this place consign’d to me, you may depend upon it, that I shall either sell them myself, or put them into such hands as will do you the most Service in the State & the most perfect Justice in every respect. (Donnan 1931:436; quoted in Young 1999:251)

In 1772, when Laurens was in London, Holman Sr. consigned forty enslaved laborers to John Lewis Gervais (1741-1798) in Charleston, who sold each for £45 (Sparks 2016:65). Further, Holman may have been referencing the 1772 ‘parcel’ on June 9, 1773, when he instructed his brother, James, to give “five males to John Lewis Gervais, a prominent Charleston slave trader ‘to sell as he did the former Parcel’” (Lowther 2011:7). In 1764, French Huguenot John Lewis Gervais immigrated to Carolina and established a 6,340-acre reserve for German Protestants near Long Cane Creek (in modern Greenwood County). Gervais was a merchant, planter, landowner and Laurens’ closest friend, protégé, and business partner (Davis 2014). Before arriving in Carolina, Scottish merchant,
slave trader and advisor to the British government Richard Oswald hired him as
a magazine clerk and granary manager in Hameln, Hanover-Brunswick to
supply the army of King George III (Davis 2014; for Gervais and his relationship
with Laurens and Oswald, *c.f.* Hamer et al.1968-2011).

John Holman Sr. and his four brothers were members of a wealthy
London trading family (Sparks 2016:63). Holman’s four brothers, who invested
in his slave trading business, were innkeepers and one was a pewterer in
London’s merchant community (Mouser 2016:30; Sparks 2016:63). Holman had
settled along the Dembia River in West Africa (modern-day Guinea) where he
engaged in slave trading and rice production. Holman’s rice production was so
extensive that at one-time Boston slave captain Daniel McNeill purchased as
much as 6,720 pounds from him (Donnan 1931:283; Koger 1995:110; Mouser 2013,
2016; Sparks 2016:63-64; Mouser and Koger mentioned that McNeill was from
Charleston).

In 1783, a major enslaved laborer uprising began in the Rio Pongo that
lasted until 1796 (Mouser 2007:27-41). Rebels were killing owners/landholders
and burning crops. In 1789, unrest from an Islamic jihad continued in West
Africa. As the second wealthiest European in the Rio Pongo slave trade, Holman
Sr. feared for his life, his family, and his enslaved laborers (Koger 1995:111;
Mouser 2016:31).
As early as 1785, John Holman Sr. began negotiating the removal of his family from West Africa to Charleston. Holman Sr. contacted his friend Henry Laurens concerning settling his family in Carolina (Koger 1995:111; Sparks 2016:57). Laurens informed him that, “five hundred pounds Sterling will secure you a Snug and improveable [sic] little Estate and twenty working hands, Men and Wives for the field, a Woman or two about the house” (Koger 1995:111; Sparks 2016:57). In a letter dated 22 February 1785, Holman Sr. reminded his brother Ary Holman, who lived at Saint Catherine Stairs near the Tower in London, that:

I recevd from Carrolina from Mr. Lawrans & Mr. Lews Gervs Beging of you to Inquire after them … I have a Number of Peopl by Me and Should I be So happy as to have a Small Plantatision bought by Mr. Gervs As I Desird him for me I wold live [leave] this Cuntry. (Coldham 1971:288-289)

On February 11, 1788, the brothers responded, “…each of us will lend him £500 sterling upon your [Henry Laurens] becoming security as you have offered” (Coldham 1971:288).

In 1787, John Holman Sr. visited Charleston to purchase a rice plantation and received clearance to bring his African wife, their five mulatto children, and other enslaved laborers (Koger 1995:111; Mouser 2016:31; Sparks 2016:57-58). Holman Sr. purchased Blessing Plantation for £2500 (Sparks 2016:57), with a loan
of £1000 from his brothers Samuel and Ary Holman in London (Coldham 1971:288). With the transaction completed, he returned to Africa to collect his family and enslaved laborers.

In February 1789, Holman Sr. sailed for Charleston onboard the Eliza “with all my fammaley … 75 People in Number, Men Women & Children” (Coldham 1971:289; RSPP #11379101, 11379102; Sparks 2016:58). To his misfortune, Holman Sr. arrived in April 1789 after a law enacted on 28 March 1787 barred the importation of enslaved laborers to South Carolina without prior permission (Donnan 1931:494; Koger 1995:114; RSPP #11379101, 11379102; Sparks 2016:58); the law was to be applied to slave traders but not to privately-owned enslaved laborers (Gilikin 2014:105). The fine for breaking this law was seizure of his slaves or a £100 fine per enslaved laborer (RSPP #11379101, 11379102). Although Holman privately owned his enslaved laborers, he was, nonetheless, a slave trader. Laurens advised Holman Sr. to sail for Savannah until the South Carolina Legislature could review his petition for entrance (Koger 1995:113-114; Sparks 2016:58).

Holman Sr. was unprepared for the additional expense of passage to Savannah. In a letter dated 22 September 1790 posted from Savannah, Holman Sr. begged his brothers to pay “Capt a John Olderman for the £24 5D, for passage from Charleston to Savannah and to assist … in lending … a Thousand £
According to your former Prommiss [sic]” (Coldham 1971:289). He implored his brothers, “Give me sum hopes and Let me hear from you soon as Possabel for God’s Sake. I am at a great Expence” (Coldham 1971:289). There is no evidence that his brothers came to his rescue; regardless, five months later John Lewis Gervais and Henry Laurens assisted Holman Sr. with a petition that mentioned only Holman’s enslaved laborers, and not his family, for a special bill that permitted Holman Sr. to move his family and enslaved laborers to Blessing Plantation (Koger 1995:114; Sparks 2016:58, 70).

In July 1792, John Holman Sr. died a resident of St. Thomas Parish and left an estate valued at £3,451 sterling and 3 shillings and an inventory that included fifty-seven enslaved laborers (Koger 1995:114-115; Sparks 2016:70). John Holman Jr. (1768-1823) inherited one-half of his estate, real and personal, and thirty-seven enslaved laborers, which with his own twenty enslaved laborers brought his total to fifty-seven enslaved laborers (Koger 1995:115). Samuel Holman (1770-?) received one-eighth of his estate, real and personal, and nine enslaved laborers, which with his own forty-two enslaved laborers brought his total to fifty-one enslaved laborers (Koger 1995:115). The remaining three-eighths of the estate, real and person, as well as the remainder of the enslaved laborers was divided and bequeathed to Henry Laurens, Jr., John Holman Jr., and Samuel Holman, in trust for the three daughters, Hester, Elizabeth, and Margaret, equally (Koger
1995:115; RSPP #21380303; Sparks 2016:70). It took fifteen years (1793-1808) and a court-ordered partition to settle the estate (RSPP #21380802; Schweninger 2008:68).

In 1791, Holman Jr. married a mulatto American named Sally and had four children. In 1794, Holman Jr. took over management of the Blessing Plantation when Laurens Jr. relinquished his power of attorney; however, by 1798, he disbanded Blessing Plantation and moved his family and enslaved laborers to a plantation in the Georgetown District (Koger 1995:115; Mouser 2016:31). By 1805, dissatisfied with South Carolina life, Holman Jr. and his family permanently returned to the Rio Pongo and he left the management of the plantation and one hundred twenty-eight enslaved laborers to his brother Samuel (Mouser 2016: 31-32; RSPP #21381421). Holman Jr. was probably the first African-born absentee planter-elite in America (Koger 1995:115-117; Mouser 2016:32). Holman continued operating in the slave trade between Africa, South Carolina, and Brazil (Mouser 2016:29).

In his Last Will, Holman Sr. emancipated his wife Elizabeth as well as his five mulatto children - John Holman Jr., Samuel Holman, Elizabeth Holman, Esther Holman, and Margaret Holman - so that they might inherit his estate (Mouser 2016:31; Sparks 2016:70; Will Book B 1786-1793:669). Not only did Holman Sr. declare these five children as free, he also declared as free three
additional children by his other wives: John Cameron Holman, Richard Holman, and William “Billy” Holman (Koger 1995:113; Sparks 2016:70). By 1795, William Holman, who remained in West Africa (modern-day Guinea) in the slave trading business, had become one of that region’s major dealers in enslaved laborers and his son, John Coleman, was active in the Nunez trade shipping enslaved laborers to Charles Town (Koger 1995:113; Mouser 2016:31).

Even though Holman Sr. regarded his children as free persons, South Carolina legislation was ambiguous enough that creditors might regard them as property rather than legitimate heirs. As stated, Holman Sr. manumitted Elizabeth, a freeborn African woman and the mother of sons John and Samuel Holman (RSSP #21380802; Sparks 2016:70). According to South Carolina law she was considered an enslaved laborer when the Holmans arrived in Charleston. It is significant that Holman Sr. manumitted Elizabeth in his Last Will. Emancipation was often complex and highly contested. Between 1790 and 1800 in the entire South, the number of free people of color rose from 32,357 to 61,241 and then rose to 108,265 in 1810 (Sparks 2016:72). By 1800, Charleston’s free people of color outnumbered free people of color in Boston, yet, they only accounted for about three percent of the total urban population (c.f. Sparks 2016). Prior to the Revolutionary War, planter-elites manumitted very few enslaved laborers; they tended to manumit only their mulatto offspring. Further,
manumitted enslaved laborers tended to be light skin, urban, female, and a mixed-race child (Sparks 2016:72). Avenues to private manumission, such as by Last Will, purchase, or civic duty, closed in 1820 when a petition to both houses of the South Carolina Legislature became mandatory by Legislative Act (Edgar 2006:341-342).

As European-African slave traders turned planter-elites, what were the Holmans’ chances of success? Where did they fall within Carolina’s social hierarchy? John Holman Sr. attempted to establish and maintain a planter-elite lifestyle for his family. As members of one of the wealthiest slaving trading families in West Africa, the Holmans held a high position of respect, privilege, and social standing (Koger 1995; Mouser 2016). For example, similar to others of the same social standing, the eldest son, John Holman Jr., was educated in Liverpool, England and followed his father into the lucrative slave trading career (Mouser 2016:28). There is no evidence that their social standing transferred to the East Branch. Did their East Branch neighbors accept them as one of their own? Perhaps it was impossible in this tight-knit kinship-based European community; there was no room for successful European-Africans at the top of their social hierarchy. Although the Holmans did not join their white planter-elite neighbors, they allied themselves with a wealthy mulatto planter family, instead (Sparks 2016:70).
Members of mixed ancestry held a middle ground between white elites and black enslaved laborers. Similar to the white community, they created close kinship-based communities that united the mulatto slaveholding class with the mulatto landholding class. For example, the Holman sisters, who fared better than their brothers, linked two mulatto families together through economic position, ‘cultural status,’ and free and mixed-blood ancestry; each sister married into the prestigious free mulatto Collins family of St. Thomas Parish (Koger 1995; Sparks 2106:72). Elizabeth Holman married Elias Collins; Margaret Holman married Robert Collins Jr.; and Esther Holman married James Anderson, directly related to the Collins family, and whose uncle Richard Oswald operated a factory in the Rio Pongo (Koger 1995:119-124; Mouser 2016:32; Sparks 2016:72).

White planter Robert Collins Sr. (d. 1799) owned a five hundred forty-five-acre plantation in St. Thomas Parish. In his Will, he left the plantation to Susanna, an African-born enslaved laborer and their five daughters and three sons, all free people of color, as tenants in common (Sparks 2016:72). Similar to white planter-elites, the Holman-Collins unions were marriages of two property-owning families. Although the Collins family plantation was in the St. Thomas and St. Denis Parishes, they were not a direct part of the East Branch community.

Did a double standard regarding mixed races exist in the East Branch community? There is evidence of racial mixing amidst the white male planter-
elite and the enslaved females. From the available sources, three family examples in the East Branch community are constructed. The purpose of including these examples is not to determine whether these liaisons were the product of involuntary consent or voluntary consent; rather, the purpose is to reveal the existence of such relationships.

A young mulatto male named Edward Tanner (1740-1820) lived at the Tanner Road Settlement on the boundary lines of Limerick and Winsor Plantations (Babson 1987a, 1987b, 1988; Smith 2012). It is speculated that Tanner was the son of Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) and his enslaved laborer companion, Dolly (b. 1712) (Ball 1998:103-104; Deas 1909:169; Smith 2012:226). Dolly had two other children; the first child, Cupid (1735-1784) was fathered by an enslaved laborer and the third child, Catherine, might have been fathered by Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball as well (Ball 1998:104). Edward and Catherine received their freedom in the Will of Elias Ball; their mother was given the choice of which of his white children would become her master (Ball 1998:104).

Shortly after Edward’s birth in 1740 at Comingtee Plantation, Ball relocated him and his mother to Quinby Plantation (Smith 2012:226). At the time of Ball’s death in 1751, young Edward and Dolly lived at the remote St. James Plantation (Deas 1909:169; Smith 2012:226). Tanner received his freedom after his father’s death and, in 1763, moved to Kensington Plantation, owned by his half-
brother Elias Ball II (Smith 2012:226). Edward became a leather tanner (the possible source of his last name) for several plantations within an eight-mile radius; he made and sold slave shoes, harnesses, and saddles as well as provided medical services to enslaved laborers (Smith 2012:226-227; c.f. Estate of Edward Tanner Account Book, Duke University). For example, Tanner sold slave shoes to John E. Poyas at Richmond Plantation, Edward Harleston at Fishpond Plantation, and Major Isaac Harleston at Irishtown Plantation. To Robert Quash at Fishbrook Plantation, Tanner sold hides and repaired saddles. In addition, he provided medical services to an enslaved laborer named George at nearby Windsor Plantation.

In 1790, Edward Tanner moved to the eastern boundary of Limerick Plantation near the border of Windsor Plantation and called his settlement ‘King Robin’ (Smith 2012:226). Tanner had the responsibility of managing rice fields, which he rented from Catherine Edwards across the creek at neighboring Windsor Plantation, and his enslaved laborers rotated rice, oats, and cotton in that field (Smith 2012:226). At that time, Tanner owned three enslaved laborers; by 1800, he owned seven enslaved laborers; and by 1820, the number grew to nine enslaved laborers (Smith 2012:227). At the time of his death at ‘King Robin’, Tanner’s possessions totaled $3,722.75 and his death certificate listed his occupation as ‘planter’ (Smith 2012:226, 228).
‘King Robin’ is the same settlement that first appeared on the 1797 plat of Limerick Plantation as the Tanner Road Settlement (Babson 1987b:35; Hardwick 1797). The location and occupancy of this isolated peripheral settlement raised questions for historical archaeologist David Babson (1987a, 1987b, 1988) who surmised that its location represented evidence of greater planter-elite control over the enslaved and their ability to negotiate boundaries. According to Babson’s Marxian analysis, based upon control and resistance, the location of the settlement signified a loss of ‘African American semi-independence.’ Contrary to Babson’s conclusion, Hayden Ros Smith’s (2012) examination of manuscript records indicated the settlement was, in actuality, occupied by Edward Tanner, a mulatto, who had the freedom to negotiate social and economic boundaries. Smith suggested that Tanner may have purchased the European ceramics, recovered archaeologically at the site, and Smith viewed the ceramics as an indication of Tanner making ‘a comfortable life,’ which contrasted with Babson’s view that the absence of colonoware in favor of European ceramics represented a loss of individual independence within plantation power relations.

A second family example of a mixed racial relationship was the Harleston family. In addition to his white family, William Harleston Sr. (1757-1816) of The Hut Plantation had a mixed-race son, Isaac, named after the planter-elite family war hero, Isaac Harleston of Irishtown Plantation (Ball 2001:4). Isaac grew up at
The Hut and received his freedom. Instead of relocating to the city, Isaac became a steward on a Harleston family riverboat. Eventually, he married and fathered three sons; his eldest son, Edward, settled at Rice Hope Plantation, a Harleston property located one mile from The Hut Plantation (Ball 2001:5).

William Harleston II (1804-1874), the son of William Harleston (1757-1816) and his second wife, Sarah Quash Harleston (1773-1821), followed his father’s footsteps. Harleston II lived with his common-law mulatto wife, Kate Wilson (1825-1886) (Ball 1998:274, 2001:9-29). White Ball family descendants speculated that Kate might have been born in Barbados then sold or traded to the Harleston family in 1850 (Ball 1998:272-277). Black Harleston family descendants and enslaved laborer lists from Elwood Plantation, recorded that Kate might have been a domestic enslaved laborer attached to this plantation when John Harleston purchased the property in 1835 (Ball 2001:7). This Kate was the ten-year-old daughter of the cook, Sarah, and a white man named Anthony Wilson; William was thirty-one years old at the time (Ball 2001:7). Between 1843 and 1867, William and Kate had eight children who became part of Charleston’s black bourgeoisie. The first three children – John, Richard, and Robert – were born at Elwood Plantation, and the neighbors referred to them as ‘Will’s black brood’ (Ball 2001:9). Black Harleston family traditions also recalled that Harleston and his enslaved laborer Sibby had an ‘outside child’, a daughter
named Patty (Ball 2001:10). In the 1850s, Harleston, Kate, and their children moved to The Hut Plantation, where Harleston had been born (Ball 2001:15).

William Harleston’s family tried to encourage him to participate in elite society; however, he does not appear to have participated in the clubs and societies like others of his social standing. Perhaps he chose isolation; he had a history of isolation and withdrawal since the deaths of both of his parents when he was a teen (Ball 2001:6-7). Perhaps the greater community isolated him; the records are silent. Coincidently, as descendants of Rene Juin, a French Huguenot who immigrated with his two brothers in 1679, Harleston and Kate’s ‘marriage’ was evidenced by their listing in the Register of Carolina Huguenots (Prioleau and Manigault 2010:986).

In 1872, the South Carolina legislature recognized interracial relationships; the following year, Harleston publicly claimed his family in his Will. In 1874, Harleston left “my bed and all my bedding” to Kate and the rest of his estate to “my brother John Harleston and to the colored woman Kate (formerly my slave) to be equally divided between them, share and share alike, and for their sole and separate use forever” (Ball 2001:21). However, a nephew, Benjamin Frost Huger (1836-1887), robbed Kate of her inheritance, except the house in Charleston (Ball 1998:274, 2001:23-28). Nonetheless, the black Harleston family prospered and became one of the wealthiest mulatto families in Charleston (c.f. Ball 2001).
A third example is from the Ball family. Following the Revolutionary War, bachelor Elias Ball III (1752-1810), also known affectionately as Old Mas’ ‘Lias, granted his enslaved laborer companion, Nancy, her freedom as a sign of a special relationship:

[Nancy] shall be permitted … to reside in the House she at Present Occupies, with the use of her Garden, & be supported on the Plantation with Provisions, during her life, and … on the first day of March in every Year, so long as she shall live, [my nephew] shall pay her, in good & lawful Money, the sum of one hundred dollars. (Ball 1998:243-244)

Free Nancy lived at Limerick from 1812 to 1834 (William J. Ball Papers, UNC). Nothing further is known about Nancy.

**Africans, African-Americans, and the Gullah Community**

From the beginning of colonization, Africans from Barbados and later from Africa came, not of their own free will, but rather as enslaved laborers. Between 1706 and 1776, over ninety-four thousand enslaved laborers entered the Charles Town harbor, disbursed throughout the Lowcountry, and comprised ninety percent of the total population (Wright 2000:80). On the eve of the American Revolution, the Lowcountry enslaved population sustained itself, largely by natural increase. By then, several generations of purely ‘African’ African Americans were born and creolized into a unique culture, which thrived in isolation from outside influences. Creolization is defined as the forging of a
new ‘unique’ society as members from diverse ethnic backgrounds adapt to their new environment (c.f. Mintz 1974). As a result, Lowcountry polycultural African demographics created a unique culture referred to as Gullah/Geechee. Gullah/Geechee refers to the language, culture, and the descendants of African and Caribbean enslaved laborers on plantations along the southeastern United States coast extending approximately forty miles inland and running two hundred fifty miles from Beaufort, North Carolina, to Jacksonville, Florida (NPS 2005). Typically, black coastal South Carolinians refer to themselves as Gullah whereas black coastal Georgians refer to themselves as Geechee (NPS 2005). The constant replenishing of diverse Africans, direct from West and Central Africa, presented the ingredients ripe for the maintenance of polycultural African customs, rituals, music, crafts, diet, linguistics, and ideas. Planter-elites purposely blended different ethnic Africans in an effort to create an enslaved homogenous workforce that obscure distinctions (Pollitzer 2005). What they created was a strong polycultural society, which shared a common worldview.

Archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians study Gullah culture from a number of perspectives including linguistics, folk beliefs, religion, crafts, architecture, and foodway (Babson 1990; Crook 2001, 2008; Crum 1940; Joyner 1984; Littlefield 1981; Opala 1987; Pollitzer 1999; Turner 1949; Wood 1974; see NPS 2005 for an extensive bibliography). Historical archaeologists, in particular,
are asking new questions. For example, Jodi A. Barnes and Carl Steen argue for placing research of Gullah communities within the historical context of the discourses that identified and inscribed Gullah upon the Lowcountry landscape; specifically, they argue that Gullah studies should emphasize community and place (2012:2). Gullah communities are rooted in extended consanguineous family relationships based upon deeply rooted African traditions: kinship, matriarchy, and polygamy (Pollitzer 1999). Although deeply rooted in Africa, generally, studies begin during the Antebellum Period with the Gullah’s people struggle for freedom. However, this dissertation asserts that the beginnings were much deeper and began with the earliest development of Lowcountry plantation society. In particular, this section focuses on the development of a Gullah community based on kinship among the enslaved in the East Branch settlement (c.f. Cody 1982a, 1982b, 1987, 2003; Littlefield 1981; Morgan 1998, and Wood 1974, for studies of kinship among Africans and African Americas).

From the beginning of colonization in 1670, Carolina was a slave colony. Unlike the colonies in Virginia or Massachusetts, Carolina’s English elites were more dependent on their enslaved laborer population than elsewhere in the North American colonies (c.f. Morgan 1998). Initially, eighteenth-century planter-elites relied less upon West African enslaved laborers than they did upon
Barbadian enslaved laborers (Eltis et al 2007:1337). As the Carolina economy stabilized, the importation of West and West Central Africans increased.

Contrary to the neighboring parish of St. James, Goose Creek, early settlers along the East Branch did not bring enslaved laborers with them when they claimed their land grants. For instance, when Affra Harleston Coming (c. 1651-1698) and Cpt. John Coming (d. 1694) developed Comingtee Plantation, they brought with them three white servants: John Chambers, Philip Onill, and Michael Lovell (Middleton 1971:21). Loyal and obedient these servants were not, for in 1672 Affra complained to the Grand Council that the three were disobedient to her in refusing to observe her lawful commands & ... Philipp Onill [threatened] to oversett [sic] the Boate wherein she was ... and giving the provisions allowed him to the Doggs and threatening to run away to the Indians & divers other grosse abuse & destructive practices... (Middleton 1971:22)

Perhaps incidents such as this one prompted John Coming, in 1682, to begin buying Indian and African enslaved laborers (Wright 2000:75). After the Comings' death, Comingtee Plantation devised to Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball and John Harleston. When twenty-two-year-old Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball arrived in 1698 to claim his inheritance, Comingtee Plantation was home to twenty enslaved African and Native Americans (Ball 1998:27, 90). In 1721, Ball reported his first
enslaved laborer purchases: Fatima, Hampshire, and Plymouth (Ball 1998:98-99). Although Fatima might have been of African origin, the other names were obviously not of African origin; perhaps Ball named these two after the naval ports in England near Devon from where he came.

Ethnic and regional origins of Africans changed over time due to factors, such as internal conflicts in Africa, access to the international slave trade, market competition, and planter-elite preference. Africans were imported from the Gold Coast, Windward Coast, Angola and the Congo (Pollitzer 2005). Using criteria such as size, strength, health, and temperament, Carolina planter-elites preferred Coramanteses, Gambians, Senegalese, Mandingos, Whydahs, Pawpaws, Congos, and Angolans (Brown 2012:76; Pollitzer 2005). As the colony stabilized and prospered with the cultivation of rice, Carolina planter-elite’s preference became specific as they actively sought enslaved laborers with specialized expertise in rice cultivation. East Branch planter-elites valued enslaved laborers from the rice coast of West Africa, in particular, the Windward coast, the most significant rice region (Littlefield 1981; Wood 1974:59). Charles Town slave traders had a strong affinity for Africans from the Rio Pongo region (Mouser 1975, 1996, 2000, 2007, 2016). An example of specificity was the following Austin, Laurens and Appleby advertisement placed on July 19, 1760:
TO BE SOLD very cheap, On Tuesday the 22d of this Instant July, At STRAWBERRY FERRY, A Choice Cargo of about TWO HUNDRED very Likely and Healthy NEGROES, Of the same Country as are usually brought from the River GAMBIA Just arrived in the snow, CHARMING ESTHER, JOHN HAMILTON Commander, from the WINDWARD and GRAIN coast. (Charles Town Gazette; Cohen 1953; Hamer et al.1972:41)

Strawberry Ferry, originally established by Act in 1705, crossed the Cooper River at Childsbury (north of the East Branch); in 1748, it vested in Lydia Child Chicken Ball for seven years (Barr 1996; Statues 1841:148; SCHM 1913:198-203). The Ferry was a landing place for supplies and goods (Diamond 1811; Rogers et al.1974:669). Richard Walker, Maurice Milling, Ralph Gaulick, Thomas Preston, and William Davidson of Liverpool owned the Charming Esther. Seems this sloop did not have a ‘charming’ existence; the Whitehall Evening Post reported on December 6, 1760 that she lost an anchor at Ormshead while attempting to get into Liverpool harbor after she had returned from depositing two hundred enslaved laborers in Charleston and her cargo of rice aboard was also damaged (Historic England).

Most Africans sold into slavery remained anonymous. It is through the written records of the elites that researchers can glean the names of a few of the enslaved and reconstruct enslaved laborer families. Henry Laurens left copious amounts of documentation throughout his career as a planter, merchant, and political leader (c.f. Hamer et al.). His papers are rich in details about his life as a
slave owner as well as a purchaser, lessor, and seller of enslaved laborers (SCHS, HSP, LOC, NYHS, UVA, and NYPL). Other valuable sources are the meticulous plantation records kept by several members of the Ball family (SCHS, SHC, Duke University, and USC). The Ball family kept copious records of family genealogy, plantation businesses, and slave lists that have been useful for research (Babson 1987a, 1987b, 1990; Ball 1998, 2001; Cody 1982a, 1982b, 1987, 1994, 2003; Opala 1987; Smith 2012; Sparks 2016). Several family members wrote family memoirs that included information about several enslaved laborers (Ball n.d.; Ball 1909; Poyas 1870). While these records do not tell us what the enslaved were thinking, they offer us a window into their world that is otherwise unavailable to researchers by other written documentation.

Cheryll Ann Cody examined Ball family records for the cultural transformation in early generations of enslaved Africans and African Americans (1982a, 1982b, 1987, 2003) and the effects of enslaved laborer separation (1994). By focusing on naming practices, Cody reconstituted six hundred twenty maternal histories for the years between 1849 and 1865; despite the rare recording of father’s names, Cody identified one hundred ninety-four women with husbands (Cody 1982a, 1982b, 1987; 2003). Cody’s detailed demographic studies provided an overview of enslaved laborer family stability on Ball plantations at the East Branch into the Antebellum Period (1994, 2003). Edward
Ball reconstructed enslaved laborer genealogies of fifteen descendant families (1998). Joseph Opala (1987) and Randy Sparks (2016) provided a case study of the acquisition and genealogy of a young female enslaved laborer child purchased by the Ball family in 1756. Using these sources and secondary sources, this next section provides evidence of the formation of the East Branch ‘Gullah’ community.

Through analyses of the available Ball enslaved laborer demographic documentation, three unusual patterns revealed information that might be extrapolated to other plantations on the East Branch to explain the development of Gullah culture and community (c.f. Cody 2003). First, the Ball family appeared to rely more on natural increase rather than on a constant influx of new African enslaved laborers. Second, a high number of African names existed among the first generation of African enslaved laborers but declined among the subsequent generations of ‘country-born’ enslaved laborers. Third, after 1770, the enslaved community experienced little disruption of enslaved laborer families through sale. Demographics, naming patterns, and community stability provided insights into how kinship informed the Gullah community.

During the frontier stage of development, Barbadians, who had the resources to “stock the country with Negroes, Cattle and other Necessaries,” sponsored most of the enslaved laborers (Brown: 2012:44-45; Wood 1974:45).
Nearly four-fifths among the enslaved were adult and male; therefore, it was common for male enslaved laborers to outnumber female enslaved laborers. Without the benefit of women and children, these enslaved laborers found themselves without the benefit of kinship ties (Brown 2012:44). Beginning in 1680, slaver traders were importing men, women, and children. For example, in 1688, Sir Nathaniel Johnson (1664-1712), a future Governor, imported more than one hundred enslaved people (Brown 2012:47). Reverend Samuel Thomas (1672-1706), Johnson’s Chaplin and a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, remarked that “many servants and slaves” were at Johnson’s Silk Hope Plantation on the East Branch of the Cooper River (Brown 2012:47; Wood 1974:47; c.f. “Letters of Rev. Samuel Thomas, 1702-1706”). Between 1750 and 1780, on the Ball plantations, adult males outnumbered adult females 23:7; just four years later, in 1784, the enslaved demographics reached near parity wherein males over fifteen outnumbered females over fifteen by 210:100 at Comingtee Plantation (Cody 1987:576; 2003). On July 15, 1765, Henry Laurens wrote to his nephew, Elias Ball of Hyde Park, that:

On Tuesday last I chose out of Messrs. Brailsford and Chapman’s Gold Coast Cargo six Negro Women they prevailed on me to take two more in all 8: which I have bought on your Account at £240 per head payable in two months from the 10th Inst. or as much sooner as you can. (Donnan 1931:414; PHS)
Demographics revealed that there was a steady increase in the number of women and children either purchased or born in the 1770s. This suggests that demographical conditions were ripe for the development of a Gullah community.

Names were important to Africans and their ‘country’ born descendants. A name formed interrelationships between family and community. Not only did names demonstrate community cohesion, names also were forms of knowledge transmission and subtle resistance (NPS 2005). For Africans, the “power to name is the power to control” (Pollitzer 1999:109; NPS 2005). Almost universally in Africa, a child has two names: a ‘Christian’ name and a ‘basket’ name (Pollitzer 1999:109, 112; 2005). For example, the Yoruba gave a child a ‘Christian’ name that was commonly used and a name given in reference to some sort of appellation at birth; the Husa also gave a child a known name, however, the first name was secret and whispered only to the baby (Pollitzer 1999:112). The Mandingo gave a child a temporary name, determined by sex and birth order; the temporary name was replaced later by a ‘true’ name that reflected an attribute, a day, circumstance of birth, or a divinity (Pollitzer 1999:11). It is reasonable to assume that Africans brought to the Lowcountry received such names at birth. A ‘basket’ name was known only within the family and therefore was resistant to outside influences (c.f. Twinning and Baird 1991). For instance, Katie Heyward (b. 1840)
was known as ‘Bright Ma’ (Ball 1998:68). Lorenzo Dow Turner recorded numerous names among Gullah people and determined that most names were “nearly always of African origin” (Pollitzer 199:129, c.f. Turner 1949:31-40).

Examination of naming patterns on the East Branch makes a strong case for not only the continuity of an African tradition, but also for the development of a Gullah community. Based upon the available Ball enslaved laborer records, naming patterns fell into two major categories: owner-selected and enslaved laborer-selected. These categories can be further divided into definitive time periods: pre-1780, 1780-1820, and post-1820. A closer examination of enslaved laborer-selected names revealed a shift from African-based names to English names and naming practices.

Often, when planter-elites purchased Africans, they renamed them. The pool of names tended to reflect name places, mythology, or literature. In 1726, Angola Amy (d. 1790), Mandingo Jack, and Igbo Clarinda arrived at Comingtee Plantation (Ball 1998:134, placed the date as 1736; Brown 2012:76; Cody 1987:573-575). Some enslaved laborer names reflected the owners English or Irish roots, which included Hampshire, Plymouth, Windsor, Devonshire, Salisbury, Liverpool, Bristol, Hammond, Surry and London (a Gambian) (Ball 1998; Cody 1987, 2003).
A high number of African names and nation names existed only among first generation enslaved laborers imported from Africa. Two enslaved laborers with Mende names included Tenah (1780-1810) and her brother Plenty (Ball 1998:69). Some Africans were given new English names, such as the Angolan purchased in 1731 known as Tom or ‘Tom White’ (Ball 1998:149-150). It should be noted that enslaved laborers, in general, did not have surnames. The fact that Tom was known as ‘Tom White’ distinguished him from another enslaved laborer known as ‘Tom Black’ (Ball 1998:201). In an effort to maintain single-use enslaved laborer names, owners often used descriptors in addition to a given name such as ‘Big’ or ‘Little,’ color, birth place, occupation, or plantation (Cody 1987, 2003). Other examples were Little Plenty, the son of Plenty and Chloe; Hannah also known as Captain Hannah; Old Peter, Little Nancy, and Little Pino (Ball 1998:71, 139, 170, 229; Cody 1987, 2003). The descriptors ‘Big’ or ‘Little’ resolved the issue of father/son- or grandfather/grandson-shared names.

Enslaved laborers who received classical names were almost exclusively male, such as Horace, Scipio, Adonis, Othello, Pompey, Caesar, Cato, and Brutus (Ball 1998:53, 71, 73; Cody 1987, 2003). Women, on the other hand, were more likely named after the owner’s sweetheart, wife, or daughter, as in the case of Lydah, second daughter of Windsor and Angola Amy, who was named after Lydia Child Chicken Ball, a new bride in the Ball family (Cody 1987:573; Deas
Literature was also a source for enslaved laborer names. Among the Ball enslaved laborers were Cordelia, Celia, Romeo, Julatta (Juliet), and Gil Bas (Cody 1987:583). Names that harkened to mythology included Agrippa, the semi-mythological king of Alba Longa; Diana/Dye, the moon goddess; Subrinagoddard/Sabrina/Sabina, the goddess of the River Severn in Celtic mythology; Cleopatra/Patra, the Queen of the Nile; and Cupid (Ball 1998:104; Cody 1987:583).

Enslaved laborers, when given the chance to self-select names for their children, used naming practices familiar to African traditions. The birth of a child represented an ancestor’s spirit residing in the child; Joseph E. Holloway (2005) noted in his field notes that, to this day, Gullah people regard every child as the ‘come back’ of some dead person. Following the categories identified above and outlined by Cody (1987), enslaved laborer-selected names fall into three distinct time periods; pre-1800, 1780 to 1820, and post-1820. The first two categories overlap due to an influx of new Africans into the enslaved laborer community; the Ball family recorded large African purchases in the early eighteenth centuries and two smaller purchases in 1787 and 1803 (Ball 1998:250, 260).

Prior to 1780, enslaved laborer names reflected the intentions of the planter-elite. The purpose was to maintain individual identity through name diversity, not necessarily for the benefit of the enslaved but rather for the
owner’s records. Unlike African naming practice, these owner-selected names lacked kinship recognition. Even so, enslaved laborers self-selected and reused owner-selected names for their children. Between 1780 and 1800, the enslaved-selected names became based upon a kin system. The practice of giving African names to enslaved laborer children was greater among eighteenth century first generation ‘country’ born enslaved laborers than second generation ‘country’ born enslaved laborers. The first generation tended to connect children to an African grandparent, while the second generation tended to reuse owner-selected names or to introduce ‘new’ names into the enslaved laborer community (Cody 1987). Before 1800, female names reflected a matrilineal linkage; however, after 1800 female namesakes shifted from a preference for mother to a preference for grandmother. A similar shift in male namesakes shifted after 1800 from grandfather to father.

In the 1780s, two shifts occurred in society that manifested in the choice of enslaved laborer-selected names (Cody 1987:579). First, enslaved laborers were being Christianized, which introduced Biblical names among the enslaved community. Second, as the Ball family relied upon a policy of natural increase rather than large enslaved laborer purchases, enslaved laborer families stabilized. After 1820, few new names entered the enslaved laborer community.
Recall that in 1790, John Holman Sr. brought African enslaved laborers, who retained their African names, to Blessing Plantation; they included Addullah, Belkekly, Coreah, Cotte-de, Cumbah, Habbah, Kisse (also a river in West Africa), Mahmah-Toay, Newmah, Newmahoy, Sadue, Sarede, Yahle, Yah Morah, and Yerebah (Koger 1995:115). By the time Holman brought these enslaved laborers, the East Branch enslaved laborer community was primarily second-generation ‘country’ born. Holman’s enslaved laborers did not reflect the pattern of the rest of the East Branch enslaved community. No extant records exist that any interaction occurred between Holman’s enslaved laborers and the East Branch enslaved laborer community.

According to African tradition, parents named children after the day of their birth; this tradition continued in the East Branch enslaved community. Table 3.1 lists day names found in the South Carolina Gazette. Common African ‘day’ names among the East Branch community included Quaco, Cudjo, Cuffy, Cuba, and Binah; also, enslaved laborers named their children after months, seasons, and holidays, such as January, Christmas, and Easter (Ball 1998; Cody 1987). The case of Quaco is particularly interesting, in that his African and owner-selected Classical name were recorded. In 1741, Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball sold a male enslaved laborer to his son-in-law George Austin, to be given to his four-year-old grandson, George Austin, Jr.; the enslaved laborer was known as
Othello alias Quaco (Ball 1998:142). African ‘day’ names often changed from one generation to the next. For example, Cudjoe was represented in one generation, Monday was represented in the second generation, and Joe was represented in the third generation (Holloway 2005). Examples of other Anglicized African day names included Quaco to Jacco, Jacky, or Jack; Jemme to James; Abba to Abby; and Phibba to Phoebe (Cody 1987). ‘Binah’ may have derived from Binta, Beneba or Subrinagoddard (Cody 1987:585). Planter-elites may have recognized the name ‘Pompey’ as a classical name but a Mende might have recognized it as a version of Kpambì meaning line, course, or handkerchief (Pollitzer 1999:129).

Beginning in the early 1800s, planter-elites turned to the ideals of paternalism. Part of their newfound attempt to make life ‘better’ for their enslaved laborers was to introduce them to Christian religious teachings. The planter-elite class felt that it was incumbent upon them to guide their enslaved laborers in the right path; the central notion was that enslaved laborers were not able to make decisions on their own and needed proper guidance. The introduction of religious paternalism and the Bible exposed enslaved laborers to a new source of names. Continuing upon Cody’s work (1987, 2003), Biblical names were drawn mainly from the Old Testament as categorized in Table 3.2. While this table represents the most popular Biblical names, other names included Moses, Aaron, Adam, Eve, Samson, Mary, Martha, and Nathan. The
Biblical name Hagar may have represented Abraham’s concubine or the name may have derived from the Mandingo name Haga (Pollitzer 1999:113).

The transition from African-derived names to English-derived names increased after 1800. As mentioned earlier, female enslaved laborers might have been named after the owner’s wife, sister, or sweetheart. The Ball enslaved laborers followed a rule that avoided or prohibited the use of the owner’s name or unique name during the lifetime of that owner. For instance, the Balls used the family founder’s name, Elias, in every generation; therefore, there was never an enslaved laborer named Elias (Cody 1987:589). The first instance of an enslaved laborer child named for an owner was after the death of Isaac Ball in 1778; the Ball family used the name again in 1785 and in 1818 during which time the enslaved laborers refused to name a child Isaac until after both had died by 1825 (Cody 1987:591). Another point of departure among the enslaved population from their owners was the avoidance of naming a child the same name as another deceased child in the same family. Enslaved laborers did practice necronymic naming, however, they reused names to replace extended kin, such as a deceased person, a person sold away, or removed (Cody 1987). The necronymic practice, commonly followed by planter-elites, of naming a child with the name of a deceased sibling within the same family was forbidden; East
Branch enslaved laborers did, however, name children after a deceased sibling (aunt/uncle) (Cody 1987).

Another factor that led to an extensive kinship network among the enslaved laborers on the East Branch was the fact that the community, as a whole, experienced very little disruption, such as being sold away. This statement is made not to minimize the harshness of slavery but rather to support the establishment of its Gullah community.

Earliest record of overseers occurred in the 1720s when Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball hired first Andrew Songster and then John Newman (Ball 1998:101). When Ball moved to Charles Town in the late 1730s, he handed over management to Elias Ball, Jr. and John Coming Ball; Charles Pemberton was hired as Comingtee Plantation’s overseer (Ball 1998:139).

The enslaved laborers lived in virtual isolation from the outside world. During the ‘sickly’ season from May to November, planter-elite families, with their house enslaved laborers, left the plantations for summer pineland villages located on higher lands; Cordesville, close to Comingtee Plantation, was one of these locations (Ball 1998:155, Lees 1980:68; NPS 2005; Pollitzer 1999). The Balls recorded a few instances when enslaved laborers did travel outside the neighborhood. On one occasion during the Revolutionary War, John Ball took Hammond, a valet from Kensington Plantation, with him to skirmishes on the
Ashley River and on another occasion London, a Gambian, encamped with him near the Stono River (Ball 1998:228). In 1796, Adonis, a footman, and Binah, a domestic enslaved laborer, traveled for five months up the East Coast with the family of John and Jane Ball (Ball 1998:254). In 1806, Isaac Ball traveled to Washington, DC with a free black named Nat Ball, who had been manumitted from the Back River Plantation in neighboring St. James, Goose Creek Parish (Ball 1998:256).

Planters along the Cooper River sold and bought enslaved laborers among themselves. In 1722, Elias Ball sold someone to William Rhett, a neighbor (Ball 1998:99). While this meant that an enslaved laborer might have a new owner, he or she, nonetheless, remained in the neighborhood close to family and friends. Recall the 1741 sale of Quaco alias Othello, Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball sold him to his son-in-law George Austin. East Branch planter-elites rarely sold enslaved laborers outside the neighborhood.

Cody (1994:119-142) examined three incidents of Ball enslaved laborer families being disrupted: in 1774, enslaved laborers were given as a marriage gift; in 1784, enslaved laborers were purchased from Tory cousin, Elias ‘Wambaw’ Ball; and in 1812, 140 enslaved laborers were received as an inheritance. In each case, the recipient was another Ball family member. The only major disruption occurred in 1819.
In 1747, newlyweds Lydia and Elias Ball moved seventy-five enslaved laborers from Comingtee Plantation to Kensington Plantation; Angola Amy and three of her children were separated from Windsor (Ball 1998:147). Despite the separation, Amy and Windsor continued their relationship as an ‘abroad marriage,’ which was common among enslaved laborer communities.

In 1748, a supposed-slave conspiracy occurred that involved enslaved laborers from several plantations along the East Branch (c.f. Ball 1998:149-152; Morgan and Terry 1982; Rucker 2006; Wyatt-Brown 2013). This ‘conspiracy’ involved Joe, from Akinfield Plantation, who planned to visit his brother, Ammon, at Irishtown Plantation. Along the way, they picked up black driver Tom Paine from Fish Pond Plantation, an African named Pompey and Tom White from Comingtee Plantation. These enslaved laborers met up with other enslaved laborers at the edge of Kensington Plantation. Other enslaved laborers involved were Carolina, a young fisherman; Agrippa, a boatman from Akinfield Plantation; Violet, a field hand; Robin and George, from Akinfield; and Cyrus, Kent, and Sambo (Ball 1998; Wyatt-Brown 2013). Rumors circulated that they intended to canoe to Charles Towne, blow up the magazine, and sail to St. Augustine (Wyatt-Brown 2013). One hundred four enslaved laborers were said to have been involved. With Royal Governor James Glen presiding, several enslaved laborers testified that a former overseer hatched the plot. Cyrus
testified to having knowledge of the plot but he later recanted his testimony (Wyatt-Brown 2013:1243; Minutes of Council in the Assembly 1747-48, 1748-49; c.f. Negro Conspiracy pts i-iii, Parish Transcripts, New York Historical Society). Others testified that there was possibly a ‘relationship’ between planter-elite James Akin and an enslaved laborer woman named Katie. Thomas Akin testified that he occasionally hid runaway enslaved laborers at his Irishtown Plantation (Ball 1998:151). After all testimony was taken, the court determined that a few ‘notorious gossipy’ enslaved laborer women, named Katie, Robin, Sue, and Susannah belonging to James Akin of Akinfield plantation, created this ‘disturbance’ among the enslaved laborer population; the women were sold and deported (Ball 1998:152; Mitchell 2011:18).

In 1819 when John Ball Sr. died, he owned six hundred sixty-nine enslaved laborers on seven plantations: viz. Pimlico, Kensington, Midway, Hyde Park, St. James, White Hall, Belle Isle, and Marshland Farm (Ball Family Papers, Estate of John Ball). At an auction from the Estate of John Ball, Sr., three hundred sixty-six enslaved laborers were sold, including one hundred ninety-seven males and one hundred sixty-nine females (Ball 1998:264). Enslaved laborers sold in one hundred thirteen units consisting of one to eleven people each. John Ball Jr., through his agent J.W. Payne, purchased sixty-seven enslaved laborers who “were related by connection with those that were owned by me before the sale”
in twenty-six units for $39,285; and Isaac Ball, through his agent M. Simons, purchased sixty enslaved laborers in seventeen units for $37,791 (Ball 1998:264; cf. John and Keating S. Ball Plantation Books). Additionally, two hundred thirteen enslaved laborers from Kensington, Midway, and Hyde Park Plantations were sold to twenty different buyers (Ball 1998:264; cf. John and Keating S. Ball Plantation Books).

The most telling account of Gullah community development and enslaved laborer family continuity began with ten-year-old Priscilla (1746-1810). Scholars have researched her arrival in 1756 on the sloop Hare through to her descendants living in the area in the twenty-first century (Ball 1998:193-197, 212; cf. Cross 2008:7-15; Kelley 2016; Opala 1987; Sparks 2014).

Rhode Island merchants William and Samuel Vernon owned the Hare and her captain was Captain Caleb Godfrey; this voyage was her first enslaved laborer sale to South Carolina (Kelly 2016). Off the coast of Sierra Leone, Godfrey purchased eighty African men, women, and children.

Serelion April 8th, 1756

Gentlemen

I have now Eighty Slaves aboard and Expect to Sail for Carolina to morrow [sic] my vessel is in Good order Clean tallowed down to the Keel I have turned your Confidant, my Chief mate out of his office and made Lion Martindal my Chief mate Cap't Clark is here and Designs to leeward all at present
By the time Godfrey arrived in Charles Town, thirteen enslaved laborers had died in the hold, another three died at the pest house on Sullivan’s Island, and most of the rest were stricken with the yaws (Campbell 2007). Godfrey consigned his enslaved laborer cargo to Henry Laurens, who promptly advertised:

Just imported in the *Hare*, Capt. Caleb Godfrey, directly from Sierra Leon, a Cargo of Likely and Healthy Slaves To be Sold upon easy terms, on Tuesday, the 29th instant June by Austin and Laurens (*South Carolina Gazette*, 25 June 1756)

The entire cargo of twenty-eight men, thirteen women, thirteen boys, and nine girls sold:

Charles Town, South Carolina 17th July 1756

Receiv’d of Austin & Laurens Eight hundred & Seventy Pounds Thirteen Shillings & Four Pence Current Money for the produce of Eight privilidge Slaves (six of them on my own Account and two for my chief Mate) in Avarage of Eighty Slaves purchas’d at Sierra Leon in the Sloop *Hare* of which Sixty three arriv’d here & are sold by them for £8,706.17.8 Net Proceed …

Caleb Godfrey

(NYHS, Slavery Manuscripts, Box VI)

When the *Hare* arrived in Charles Town, East Branch planter-elites were active purchasers of the Africans. Elias Horry and Daniel Lesesne, two prominent French Huguenots, purchased seven enslaved laborers; Henry
Laurens purchased nine enslaved laborers; Nicholas Harleston purchased three men; two women, Sarah Hext, widow of Joseph Hext and future wife of John Rutledge; and Mary Russell, wife of Jeremiah Russell, purchased two men enslaved laborers each (NYHS Slavery Manuscripts Box VI; Sparks 2014). The most active bidder, Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball, purchased six African children for £460 (Campbell 2007; Sparks 2014:177-179, 248); the four boys were Sancho, age nine; Peter, age seven; Brutus, age seven; and Harry, age six, and the two girls were Priscilla, age ten, and Belinda, also age ten (Ball 1998:193; Donnan 1931:161; Sparks 2014:287).

Belinda disappeared from all records; perhaps she did not survive or was sold (Sparks 2014). Harry became a field hand and never married. In 1784, Harry, too, disappeared from the records; perhaps he left with the British, died, or was sold (Sparks 2014). Peter, also known as Mandingo Peter, married another enslaved laborer named Monemia and raised a family; in the 1770s, Peter and his family were relocated from Comingtee Plantation to Kensington Plantation (Ball 1998:194). Eventually, in 1810, Peter disappeared from the records. Sancho became a field hand and entered into a partnership with Affie; they had three children named Sancho, Saby, and Belinda. Shortly before the Revolutionary War, they were moved from Comingtee Plantation to Kensington Plantation (Ball 1998:194). The elder Sancho was among the fifty-one enslaved laborers who ran
away with the British; however, he returned to Kensington Plantation (Ball 1998:194). Sancho died in 1833. In 1819, Affie and her children were among the enslaved laborers sold at auction.

Priscilla partnered with enslaved laborer Jeffrey and together they had ten children, six of whom survived to adulthood (Cross 2008:13). Their children were Friday (1763-1773) who died at ten of fits, Monemia (1766-1832), Little Binah (1768-1770), Harriet (1771-1780), Charlotte (1773-1780), Marcia (1775-1857), Lettice (1777-1831), Amy (b. 1779), and Jeffrey (1786-1841) a carpenter (Ball 1998:184; Lowcountry Africana). With another husband named Primus, Priscilla had Peter (1760-1824) (Lowcountry Africana).

In 1811 when Priscilla died, she had thirty grandchildren. Monemia’s children were March (1783-1839), Hannibal (b. 1785), Priscilla (1789-1805), Quacoo (1792-1828), and Tenah (1794-94) (Lowcountry Africana). Marcia partnered with Maurice; their children were Minte (1809-1825), Sally (b. 1877), Stephen (1813-1816), Clarissa (b. 1815), Yaya (b. 1815), Fatima (1817-1822), Pallas (b. 1822), and Maurice (b. 1824) (Lowcountry Africana). Lettice partnered with Isaac; their children were Hannah (1793-1826), Carlo (1795-1850), Katie (1799-1832), Cuffie (1800-1819), Lettice (1796-1860), and Sue (1801-1845) (Lowcountry Africana). Amy partnered with Scipio; their children were Jackie (1802-1842), Guy (b. 1805), Sally (b. 1806), Sampson (1808-9), Charles (1810-10), Julatta (1813-
1856), Daphne (b. 1816), Sander (b. 1829), Scipio (1822-1860), Affie (b. 1824), and Adam (b. 1826) (Lowcountry Africana). Peter’s partner is unknown; however, they had a child named Prince (1780-1845) (Lowcountry Africana). The last enslaved family member of Priscilla’s descendants lived at Limerick Plantation; after emancipation, Henry took the last name Martin and was also known as Peter Henry Robards Martin (Ball 1998:201; Cross 2008:13). The incredible story of Priscilla inspired the University of Florida’s Africana Heritage Project to research and document the genealogies of other Ball enslaved laborers (c.f. Lowcountry Africana website).

Another enslaved family to thrive on the East Branch descended from Angola Amy. A few years after arriving at Comingtee Plantation Angola Amy (d. c.1790) partnered with Windsor (d. c.1790) and became the matriarch of five generations of descendants who resided at various plantations on the East Branch (Ball 1998:134-135). Between 1743 and 1758, Amy and Windsor had seven children, four daughters and three sons. Their children were Christmas (b. 1743), Easter (b. 1746), Lydah (b. 1748), Surry (b. 1748), Dye (b. 1753), Subrinagoddard (b. 1755), and Cleopatra (b.1758) Cody 1987).

From the late 1760s to the early 1790s, the daughters gave births to thirty-one children (Brown 2012:81; Cody 1987:574). Easter’s children were David (1766), Amey (1769), January (1771), Windsor (1773), twins Exeter and Isabel
(1775), Dick, and another unnamed child (1778) (Cody 1987:574). Dye partnered with the Gambian London and their children were Amey (1772), Beck (1774), Marcus (1777), Lydia (1779), Windsor (1781), Easter, 1784), Flora (1786), London (1786), Christmas (1791), Glasgow (1793), and twins Billy and Sam (1798) (Cody 1987:574). Subrinagoddard’s children were Amey (1775), July renamed Windsor (1777), Diana (1779), March (1780), Christmas (1783), and Easter (Cody 1987:574). Cleopatra partnered with Smart and their children were Windsor (1775), Cordelia (1777), Jeme (1780), Jacky (1782, and Dinah (1786) (Cody 1987:574).

During the colonial period, planter-elites and enslaved laborers experienced close contact. Living in close proximity to each other created a level of intimacy that reflected similar cultural patterns. However, with the increase of wealth among the planter-elite, not only social distance increased, but also social hierarchies cemented and planter-elites transferred plantation management to overseers as they integrated themselves and their families into Charles Town’s urban life (Ball 1998:261, 297). As mentioned earlier, the Ball family recorded overseers at Comingtee as early as 1720 when Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball moved to Charles Town and brought in several overseers: Andrew Songster, John Newman, and Charles Pemberton; Thomas Finklea became an overseer at Comingtee in the 1827 and continued throughout the 1830s (Ball 1998:56, 72,101, 139). Beginning in 1800s, wealthy planter-elites of the East Branch were spending
more time in urban Charleston (Ball 1998:261, 297). More importantly, the increasing absence of the planter-elite increased the level of independence and freedom experienced by enslaved Africans and African Americans along the East Branch.

Throughout the history of the East Branch plantations, there were incidents of Africans and African Americans resisting their master by running away. The earliest mentioned runaway was an enslaved laborer named Booba, who said he belonged to Mr. Ball; his owner was Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (Ball 1998:187). In 1766, an ad was placed for three runaway men: Primus, Caesar, and Boson (Boatswain) (Ball 1998:186). Carolina, the fisherman involved in the 1748 conspiracy, ran with Patra and their son, Truman (Ball 1998:185).

During the Revolutionary War, many enslaved laborers took advantage of the chaos; the Balls recorded a mass exodus of up to one-third of the Kensington enslaved laborer population (Ball 1998:229; John Ball Sr. Account Book, 1780-1784). Most left by boat and their names included Toby, Hyde Park Abraham, Phoebe and her daughter, Julia, Flora and her child, Adonis, Pino and his wife Nancy, Little Nancy, Polly, Dick, Jewel, Little Pino, Nanny and her child Nelly, Peter, Eleanor, Isabel, Joney, Brutus, Charlotte, and Humphrey (Ball 1998:229; Lowcountry Africana). Some enslaved laborers, like Charlotte, were not fortune enough to get away and were captured (Ball 1998:229).
After the Revolutionary War, the Kensington Plantation records listed only one hundred twenty-three enslaved laborers who were mainly either young or old (Ball 1998:239, 244). Elias Ball III and his brother John Ball, divided the Kensington enslaved laborers; Elias Ball III took sixty-two people to Limerick Plantation and John Ball kept the remaining sixty-one at Kensington Plantation (Ball 1998:244). The Ball family was not the only East Branch planter-elites to lose enslaved laborers; Frank Symons, enslaved laborer to Edward and Lydia Ball Simons, and Polly Shubrick, enslaved laborer to Thomas Shubrick, disappeared (Ball 1998:239).

The slave trade closed at the beginning of the Revolutionary War and reopened at the end of the war. In 1788, however, the state closed the trade again with an Act that barred importation from Africa and “Negro Slaves, Mulattoes, Indians, Moors, or Metizoes bound for a term of years” from other states (South Carolina Gazette 1804; Gilikin 2014:105). During the brief period that the trade was opened, Elias Ball III purchased twenty-six enslaved laborers consisting of one single man named Cudjo and five families with their children; the couples included Charles and Peggy, Thom and Molly, Aspath and Dido, Cuffy and Amy, and Dubin and Bella (Ball 1998:250).

At the national level, South Carolina politicians fought for the right to import enslaved laborers. Demand by planter-elites for labor forced the
temporary reopening of the international slave trade in 1803; slave traders flooded South Carolina with Africans. More Africans entered the state between 1790 and 1800 than between 1800 and 1810 (Gilikin 2014:105). In 1803, for example, the Ball family purchased new Africans; John Ball bought six males named Moses, Aaron, Nathan, Ishamel, Israel, and Esau. Further, he added twenty-two people in a single purchase, two-thirds were men and one-third were boys. Ball, then, went back and purchased seven women: Rosina, Juno, Judy, Tenah, Pallas, Bobbet, and Molly (Ball 1998:260).

After the final banning of the international slave trade in 1808, new laborers came either from Virginia or from less successful planter- elites. Yet, on the East Branch, the Ball family relied upon the enslaved laborers they already owned. They merely moved families among the plantations they owned. Isaac Ball used this as his management strategy; between 1812 and 1825, he moved enslaved families among his four plantations at Limerick, Quinby, Hyde Park, and Back River Plantations (Ball 1998). Throughout the 1820s, enslaved laborer villages were broken up when the Ball family rented out single laborers or entire families for terms of six months to a year (Ball 1998:297). For example, John Ball Jr. was told to “break up that whole set, dispersing them among your other negroes and form a new gang” (Ball 1998:304).
In the decades following the Revolutionary War, Charleston’s future was wrought with uneasiness. The 1791 Haitian Revolution reignited fears of insurrection when, between 1791 and 1809, large numbers of French Haitian refugees and their enslaved laborers sought Charleston for sanctuary (Gilikin 2014). In July 1792, Jean Baptiste Caradeux (1741-1810), the General and Commander in Chief of San Domingo and owner of sugar estate Bellevue located in the Cul-de-sac plain, was among the first wave of refugees in Charleston, who arrived with funds to reestablish himself among a planter-elite. Caradeux arrived with twenty-five enslaved laborers and settled in St. Thomas Parish (Gilikin 2014:61-62). His nickname was “Caradeux the Cruel’ because he was known to be particularly cruel to his enslaved laborers; in San Domingo, he was known to have decapitated fifty enslaved laborers and lined the fences of his plantation with their bloody heads (Bongie 2014). He lived a rather obscure life in Carolina. His white and mulatto descendants celebrate his memory as a gallant defender of French and Old South values. Haitians remember his brutality (Geggus 2001:93-111).

Initially, Charleston welcomed the French refugees by creating the Benevolent Society to collect funds to aid them (Gilikin 2014:81-89). East Branch planter-elites were very active in this endeavor: John Huger (City Intendant at the time), Henry William DeSaussure, Edward Rutledge, and Rawlins Lowndes
were trustees; Archibald Broün collected funds; and Joseph Vesey participated as well (Gilikin 2014). As more refugees and enslaved laborers arrived, planter-elites distanced themselves from the French refugees; they did not want close association with an enslaved laborer rebellion (Gilikin 2014). Consequently, in 1808, South Carolina banned immigration of free people of color from the West Indies. In 1817, national support grew for the American Colonization Society to relocate free and emancipated blacks to Africa; however, South Carolina planter-elite were against it.

Economically, Charleston did not begin to recover until after the War of 1812. During the war, England shifted trade from Charleston to New England (Butler 2013). Despite a slow recovery, another economic depression occurred in 1819 from which Charleston did not begin to recover until after the War with Mexico in 1848 (Butler 2013; Edgar 1998:273-275; Poplin and Philips Jr. 2011:30).

The 1820 political debate regarding the expansion of slaving weighed heavily on the minds of elites and enslaved laborers alike (c.f. confession of Jack Purcell in Negro Plot 1822). Amid all this uncertainty, in general, planter-elites looked for some reference of stability by honoring their Revolutionary War heroes. The East Branch planter-elite community, that was immensely rich and felt immensely secure, had turned inward upon itself. Anyone who argued for change was the enemy. Change, however, came in the guise of a free black man.

The Denmark Vesey Conspiracy and Its Implications

In 1790, John Vesey a Bermudian sea captain and slave merchant purchased fourteen-year-old Télémaque (1776-1822). The young enslaved laborer assisted Captain Vesey in the slave trade as an interpreter. Not only did this enslaved laborer speak English but he also spoke French and Spanish and could read and write. After the Revolutionary War, Captain Vesey retired to Charleston and hired out Télémaque as a skilled carpenter. In 1799, at the age of 32, Télémaque won $1,500 in the East Bay Lottery, purchased his freedom for $600, and began his own business as a carpenter (Negro Plot 1822). Although now a free man, Denmark Vesey, as he was now called, maintained a closeness to Charleston’s enslaved community. Purportedly, Vesey had several enslaved ‘wives’ and many children (Negro Plot 1822). Egerton (2004:256) suggests that an enslaved laborer named Polly at Comingtee Plantation might have been one of Vesey’s wives; thus, Egerton’s scholarship reveals a tentative association between the East Branch and the Vesey conspiracy.

At the age of fifty, Vesey reportedly arranged for an enslaved laborer insurrection to take place on Bastille Day, Sunday, July 14, 1822 (Negro Plot
1822). Sunday was a day when enslaved laborers could visit town unmolested. His plan was to kill the white population, free enslaved laborers as had been done in Santo Domingo, and sail to the new black republic, Haiti, for refuge. Recruiters were sent as far away as Georgetown, the Combahee River, and St. Johns Parish (Negro Plot 1822; Rodriguez 2007:494-495). Fearing that plans would leak to white authorities, Vesey moved up the date by one month; still, news of the impending insurrection leaked to authorities. Intendant James Hamilton Jr. (1786-1857), owner of The Villa Plantation on the East Branch, ordered the militia to arrest all enslaved laborers and free blacks involved in the conspiracy. Hamilton oversaw the closed trial and his coverage shaped public perceptions in line with what he and the court wanted them to believe. There was no coverage in newspapers of the hearings (c.f. Negro Plot 1822). Governor Bennett published an account that downplayed the danger and emphasized that the secret proceeding violated state law.

In more ways than anticipated, events of the alleged conspiracy reached all the way to the East Branch neighborhood. Ball family records were silent about the incident; Ball family oral tradition, however, held that on the night before the expected uprising the family armed themselves with guns and sat vigil while their overseers set bonfires near the gates of their plantations (Ball 1998:268).
Several conspirators had either direct or close connection with the East Branch neighborhood. Vesey’s first lieutenant Peter, also known as Peter Poyas, was a black ship carpenter who lived in Charleston and was a Class Leader of the African Church associated with Denmark Vesey. Peter belonged to James Poyas (1806-1850), a brother of Eliza Catharine Poyas Ball (1794-1867) of Windsor Plantation (Ball 1998:265; Negro Plot 1822). Vesey’s strategy was to attack at night and Poyas, with his military experience, volunteered to lead the assault on the arsenal (Rodriquez 2007:389). Additionally, Poyas noted the location of all shops in the Charleston area where weapons could be found (Negro Plot 1822). He tried to recruit as many skilled enslaved laborers, such as blacksmiths, as possible. Choosing to go to death on his own terms, Poyas refused to divulge any information on the conspirators or their plans. He went out exclaiming, “Do not open your lips! Die silent, as you shall see me do!” (Egerton 2000:184; Negro Plot 1822; Rodriguez 2007:388-390; Starobin 1970).

Monday Gell was the only conspirator to testify and name names. Gell testified that Paris Ball, an enslaved laborer belonging to Ann Simons Ball (d. 1840) of Comingtee Plantation, was often in the company of known conspirators (Ball 1998:266; Negro Plot 1822). Paris was hired out as a stevedore on William’s Wharf in Charleston (Ball 1998:266; Thompson 2015). Paris and his master’s wife, Eliza Catharine Poyas Ball (1794-1867), grew up together at Windsor Plantation.
Two days before Paris was scheduled to be hanged, Isaac Ball petitioned Governor Bennett to deport him rather than to execute him. Paris received his pardon (Ball 1998:270). Jonathan Lucas II (1775-1832) of Middleburg Plantation was called to testify about the involvement of three of his enslaved laborers. Bram, John, and Richard admitted to knowing about the insurrection but denied participating in the planning (Negro Plot 1822).

When all was said and done, one hundred thirty-one enslaved and free blacks were arrested; thirty-three were released with no trial; one hundred one appeared before tribunals (Negro Plot 1822). Thirty-seven blacks, including Vesey’s son Sandy, were possibly transported to Spanish Cuba. Paris Ball was among them. Their owners were required to arrange and pay the cost of transportation to another enslaved laborer society (Egerton 2000). Thirty-five, including Denmark Vesey, were hanged; twenty-three were acquitted; three were found not guilty but were whipped; and two died in custody (Negro Plot 1822). One free black was released upon the condition that he immediately leave the state. Table 3.3 presents a list of enslaved laborers and free blacks associated with the Vesey Conspiracy who were linked to the East Branch neighborhood. Quash Harleston was born to Akan parents. On July 29, 1822, Quash, with his family and two or three other free people of color, boarded the Dolphin and sailed for Cape Mesurado aka Cape Montserrado (Egerton 2000:101-102; Rucker
Cape Mesurado is the promontory, where on April 25, 1822 freed African-American settlers established a settlement near Monrovia, Liberia.

Four white males were charged with ‘inciting enslaved laborers to insurrection’ in the conspiracy. The Court and Council used the opportunity in sentencing these white men as a warning to other whites who might have been involved or were sympathetic to the abolitionist movement. The Court determined that William Allen, a Scottish sailor, being a white man, he could not be trusted (Starobin 1990). To this charge, he replied, “though he had a white face, he was a negro in heart” (Starobin 1990). The Court sentenced Allen to serve twelve months in jail, pay a $1,000 fine, and to provide a five-year security for good behavior. John Ignesnias, a Spanish seaman, and Jacob Danders, a German peddler, received a sentence of three months, a $100 fine, and needed to post security for good behavior. Andrew Rhodes, a shopkeeper, received six months in jail, a fine of $500 and posting security for good behavior. His sentence was virtually a sentence of life imprisonment because he was too poor to pay the fine and security (Rubio 2012; Starobin 1970).

What affect did the alleged Vesey uprising have on the East Branch neighborhood? Dr. Frederick Poyas, perhaps, expressed the fears of all East Branch owners when he stated that enslaved laborers would riot “without anyone to control them” (Babson 1998:68; Barile 2014:135). Although Babson and
Barile, relying on Babson, included this quote by Dr. Poyas in their studies, I could not corroborate the validity of the statement. Nevertheless, Jonathan Lucas II moved his wife and ten youngest children from Middleburg Plantation to his estate in London; from there, he managed his Carolina plantations – Middleburg, Old Town, and Rice Hope, Santee - until his death (Hill 2003; Timmons n.d.).

In July 1823, the South Carolina Association formed a vigilance committee to oversee enslaved laborer activity. Jonathan Lucas III (b. 1800) was aide-de-camp of Charleston and authored a handbook, which detailed the behavior of whites during insurrections (January 1977:193; Lucas 1822, cited in Barile 2014:135). Keating Simons (1753-1834), cousin of Jonathan Lucas III, was President of the Association; other officers included planter-elites Thomas Pinckney, Henry Deas, Joseph Manigault, Stephen Elliott, and Robert J. Turnbull; Simons, Pinckney, Deas, and Manigault held land in/or near the East Branch (Forbes 2007:158; Ford 2009:283). The purpose of the Association, according to its members, was to put an end to:

the daily violation or evasion of laws, made to regulate the conduct of our colored population,” and to “aid the execution of the laws founded upon the local and peculiar policy of South Carolina, by giving to the Civil Magistrate, through its agents ... information of their infringement. (Forbes 2007:158; Ford 2009:283)
Several East Branch planter-elites made architectural landscape changes at their plantations. At Middleburg Plantation, the Vesey uprising precipitated the breakup of enslaved laborer settlements into smaller units; the owner moved them to peripheries while moving barns and stables closer to the central settlement (Barile 2004:121-137). According to Barile’s study, six other Lowcountry plantations showed similar landscape changes. For example, settlements on Limerick Plantation were abandoned between 1820 and 1830 and split into several small villages on the periphery of the plantation (Barile 1999:99; 2004:135). Barile mistakenly relied on Babson (1988) and Lees (1980) in stating that all of Limerick’s enslaved laborers occupied the Tanner Road Settlement. As discussed earlier, the mulatto Edward Tanner and his enslaved laborers occupied this settlement (c.f. Smith 2012). Between 1822 and 1825 at Medway Plantation, the owners changed the oak allée and moved several outbuildings in closer proximity to the main house (Barile 2004:135). At Comingtee Plantation, the new rice barn was built closer to the main house (Barile 2004:135).

For enslaved laborers and free people of color, the alleged Vesey uprising revealed the awareness of the growing desire for freedom. Even more so, enslaved laborers proved they were not ‘children’ who were happy with their role at the bottom of the social hierarchy. They were knowledgeable about rights of freedom and desired to improve their standing in the Lowcountry. With
intimate knowledge of the inner workings of the plot among East Branch enslaved laborers, no longer could planter-elites remain complacent about their enslaved laborers.

Ultimately, the Denmark Vesey Insurrection of 1822 jolted the city and the East Branch, out of a mindset based on complacency to one based on stability by suppression. The state established curfews, forbade black assembly, and prohibited black education (Edgar 1998:308). Furthermore, the state restricted movement of free blacks and free people of color. If a member of this group left the state, he or she could not return.

Additionally, free blacks required a white guardian to vouch for their integrity (Edgar 1998:308; Koger 1995:181). The 1822 Seaman’s Act required imprisonment of free black sailors in jail until their ship left port; this Act was overturned as unconstitutional for violating an international treaty with England (Edgar 1998:329). The Council called for a standing militia or municipal guard, which became The Citadel (Randle and Ferrell 2010).

Conclusion

As I discussed in this chapter, the East Branch neighborhood represented the larger Carolina Lowcountry’s racially and socially ordered society. Drawing on the concept of the ‘open’ society, before the Revolutionary War, the East Branch community consisted of various people from various polycultural
backgrounds. When the ‘first’ families arrived at the East Branch, they brought their individual languages, customs, and ideologies. However, by the second and third generations their descendants’ overwhelming desire to emulate the English landed gentry and their tendency towards intermarriage coalesced into a tight-knit community that resulted in a ‘closed’ society of affluent and aristocratic planter-elites who associated chiefly among themselves. The East Branch enslaved Africans and African Americans community was once ‘open’ and included polycultural Africans from multiple regions. As East Branch planter-elites became more selective in their enslaved laborer choices and enslaved labor demographic parity stabilized, a unique creolized enslaved community emerged. I suggest that at the same time as the planter-elite, East Branch enslaved laborers, who lived largely in isolation, developed a parallel kin-based community and became a ‘close’ society during their second and third generations. The East Branch ‘Gullah’ kin-based community developed much earlier than scholars have previously argued. Not only did East Branch planter-elites cut themselves off from the Atlantic World but as they turned inward they subconsciously immersed themselves in the unique dominate Gullah culture. As Gullah culture developed, the elites absorbed Gullah’s rich language, foodways, and musical traditions. For example, the eighteenth-century aristocratic Charlestonian accent
included elements of Gullah referred to as ‘high Gullah’ (Rogers (1980:79). It is possible, therefore, that similar patterns exist at other plantation neighborhoods.

The maintenance of strict social hierarchy precluded the incorporation of outsiders who did not exemplify the Carolina planter-elite ethos. Free people of color, often the children of planter-elites, ranked decidedly below the white planter-elites, yet they maintained closer relationships with white elites than with the enslaved population. It is significant that liaisons between planter-elite men and enslaved women, in some instances, survived and flourished within the East Branch community. It is just as significant that the East Branch community seemingly ostracized the European African Holman family. The Holmans were an anomaly in the midst of a well-established, close-knit community; their lifestyle and customs were most likely ‘foreign’ to the second and third generation planter-elites who experienced little contact with people who exhibited a ‘wholly African’ worldview.

By the end of the eighteenth century, the East Branch was a ‘closed’ society of affluent and wealthy planter-elites and strong kin-based Gullah laborers who associated among themselves. Planter-elites thought they had found the ‘perfect’ existence. Wealth made it possible for elites to turn over day-to-day management to overseers as they indulged themselves in luxuries of leisure life in Charleston. Following the ideas of religious paternalism, elites also
felt that they provided everything necessary to satisfy the ‘needs’ of their enslaved labors. Planter-elites were secure and safe in the idea that nothing would influence their isolated world in the country.

The Age of Revolution was a watershed for both communities. Little did they realize that the enslaved were not only watching the reactions of white society to the American, French, and Santo Domingo revolutions, but they were also contemplating their own positions with the world-at-large. The implications of the Denmark Vesey Insurrection/Conspiracy shook the very foundations upon which the elites had so stridently structured the racial order of their very existence. For the first time in Carolina’s history, the rising number of free people of color threatened to upend their carefully balanced house of cards. White reaction was swift and brutal as white society enacted a policy of suppression against free and enslaved blacks. In the following chapters, this dissertation will enhance our understanding of how the role of ideology (chapter six) and mobility (chapter seven) was created, maintained, and altered in the East Branch landscape during the Early Republic Period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Cudjoe</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Cubbeath</td>
<td>Beneba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Quaco</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Quao</td>
<td>Abba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Cuffee</td>
<td>Phibba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Quamin</td>
<td>Mimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Quashee</td>
<td>Quasheba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: *South Carolina Gazette*, 9 February 1738; Holloway 2005:85
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patriarch</th>
<th></th>
<th>King David</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmael</td>
<td>Hagar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esau</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 Disposition of East Branch Conspirators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaved</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laborer/Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Poyas</td>
<td>James Poyas</td>
<td>Shipwright</td>
<td>Hanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungo Poyas</td>
<td>James Poyas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acquitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Poyas</td>
<td>Dr. John E. Poyas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Transported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Horry</td>
<td>Elias Horry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acquitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bram Lucas</td>
<td>Jonathan Lucas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acquitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lucas</td>
<td>Jonathan Lucas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acquitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompey Bryan</td>
<td>John Bryan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acquitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quash Harleston (free)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acquitted &amp; Emigrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Harleston</td>
<td>Mr. Harleston</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acquitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Shubrick</td>
<td>Mrs. Shubrick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Ball</td>
<td>Ann Ball</td>
<td>Stevedore</td>
<td>Transported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Egerton 2000; Hines 1997, 2000); Negro Plot 1822
CHAPTER FOUR
EAST BRANCH PLANTATIONS

The plantations along the East Branch of the Cooper River (hereafter East Branch) formed a distinct riverfront neighborhood. Ties of blood or marriage connections among the ‘first’ families gave rise to a very close knit, kin-based community. These ‘first families’ became the core of Carolina’s emerging prominent elite planters who created Lowcountry dynasties. Bonds of ‘blood and friendship’ became the model for class identity and culture (c.f. Glover 2000). Strategies, such as advantageous marriages, partible inheritance, sibling-based horizontal connections, and mutual cooperation created a homogenous, exclusive, interdependent ‘closed’ society intent on distancing themselves from the outside and protecting themselves from rivals. Perhaps Grassby (1995:329) summed it up best: they represented “a bilaterally extended, dense tribalistic network” of kin.

Landownership is covered in depth in this chapter to understand how deeply and intricately connected the planter-elite created their community. Creating a chain of title for a single plantation in the Colonial Period is a daunting undertaking. By re-creating chains of title for the entire community, several patterns appear. Initially, people from diverse backgrounds settled along
the East Branch for different reasons. Over time, their differences dissolved as the region developed and solidified into a distinct community. Each plantation was affected by its occupants and each occupant left his or her mark on the land. By examining the chains of title, historical archaeologists can understand how the planter-elite created and maintained their intricately nuanced balance of power along the East Branch.

From 1670 to 1719, the Lords Proprietors made land grants, sometimes referred to as ‘memorials’. Governors issued warrants and ordered plats and surveys; most of these documents have been lost (c.f. Salley 1944; Smith 1903). After 1682, an indenture was used in exchange for quitrents. From 1749 to 1773, headright grants were recorded in the South Carolina Council of Journals (SCAH). The recording of land required many steps: (1) an appearance before the Governor and Council to request a warrant, (2) a warrant given to surveyor-general to lay out land, (3) warrant and plat recorded, (4) swearing of allegiance to the King and fidelity and submission to the Lords Proprietors and the Fundamental Constitution, (5) Governor passed the grant under his seal and the signature of three council members, and finally, (6) recording of the grant in the registrar’s office (Smith 1903:27). The process was not without its share of fraudulent land speculations and land grabbing abuse by Landgraves, especially between 1719 and 1731 (Smith 1903:34-53). For instance, in 1686, Sir Nathaniel
Johnson received a proprietary grant of 24,000 acres; however, by 1730, he did not execute his claim. Under Royal rule, the court found his grant was illegal because it failed to designate exact location (ibid). The massive accumulation of land retarded growth in the colony; the Landgraves and several powerful families grabbed up the best land. More importantly, the pattern of land accumulation led to the wealthy slaveholding planter-elite aristocracy peculiar to Lowcountry society.

To understand the intricate kin-based East Branch neighborhood, this chapter presents a chain of title for thirty-three plantations from proprietary grants to the 1820s. Following the transfer of property revealed the extent of how deeply ingrained the Lowcountry planter-elite culture, based on intermarriage, manifested in the region. To distinguish various generations with repetitive names, known birth and death dates are included in parenthesis following their names.

Place names (toponyms) provide geographical reference in the world. Over time, place names change; therefore, consistency and accuracy are essential to reduce confusing one place with another. Toponyms can provide clues to settlement patterns, periods of immigration, and ideologies. From its founding in 1670 until 1719, ‘Charles Town’ was the preferred toponym; from 1719 to 1783
the toponym ‘Charlestown’ was used; and after 1783 the modern toponym ‘Charleston’ was established (Chisholm 1911:945).

Several publications provided useful information for the Proprietary Period. South Carolina judge, historian, and plantation owner H.A.M. (Henry Augustus Middleton) Smith (1853-1924) authored articles for the South Carolina Historic and Genealogical Magazine, which described colonial Lowcountry landownership (1911a, 1911b, 1913, 1917a, 1917b, 1931, and reprints in 1988a, 1988b, and 1988c). Dr. John Beaufain Irving (1800-1881) provided a comprehensive description of the Cooper River Plantations in the early 1800s (1842). In the 1840s, Irving owned three plantations on the East Branch and made his home at Kensington Plantation (Miles 2004:67). As with other scholarship, this dissertation relied heavily on these two sources to re-create landownership and planter-elite genealogy of the East Cooper plantations.

Several descendants provided useful documentation and pamphlets regarding landownership and family relations. Anne Simons Deas (1845-1928) wrote Recollections of the Ball Family of South Carolina and Comingtee Plantation (1909). Under the pseudonym ‘Ancient Lady’ Elizabeth Ann Scott Poyas (1792-1877), first cousin and wife of Henry Smith Poyas (1787-1824), published several historical pamphlets about the people and history of the Cooper River plantations (1855, 1870). Edward Ball’s groundbreaking book about the Ball
family enslaved laborers provided context for the Ball family plantations (1998). Berkeley County Historical Society’s online database, “The Early Families of the South Carolina Low Country,” provided valuable information about colonial families. An online database of over 132 million cemetery records was consulted to verify conflicting dates as well as a source for kinship relationships.

First, the ownership of the Baronies, created in St. John’s Berkeley Parish and St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish, are discussed. Next, plantations were grouped into eight groups by either their development along the same trajectory or proximity to each other. Group I includes Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, Midway, and St. James Plantations. Group II includes Comingtee/Stoke, Fishpond, and Hut Plantations. The Bonneau Ferry, Villa, Richmond, Farmfield, and Bossis are in Group III. Group IV includes Windsor, Fishbrook, and Silk Hope Plantations. Group V includes Quinby, Middleburg, Pompion Hill, Simons Ville, Horts/Halidon Hill, Smokey Hill, and Camp Vere Plantations. Group VI includes Blessing, Cedar Hill and Cherry Hill Plantations. Group VII includes Hagan, Akinfield, Moreland, Benevento, and Spring Hill Plantations. Group VIII includes several adjacent inland plantations with connections to those fronting on the East Branch. Each group contains a table that reveals the ownership from circa 1783 to the 1820s.
Lastly, this chapter examines the impact of how kinship and marriage influenced the East Branch riverfront neighborhood. Following the scholarship of Lori Glover (2000), four aspects of kinship development are examined. The first apparent aspect was that most families traced their roots to the migration of siblings. A second aspect in the construction of this powerful interrelated community was the practice of cousin and exchange marriage between sets of siblings from two different families. A third aspect was the expectation of fathers and mothers to remarry and start second, and sometimes third, families. The fourth aspect was the practice of naming children after living relatives reinforced the desire to secure the child in the broader family network. Finally, the families, who owned and managed these plantations between the 1780s and 1820s, were examined closer and revealed that by the third generation a close-knit kin-based community developed with extremely few outsiders.

**Baronies**

The idea of the baronies was to re-create the village system similar to that in England. The Fundamental Constitution of Carolina created two classes of nobility: landgraves who received forty-eight thousand acres and cassiques who received twenty-four thousand acres (Miles 2004:22). The Lords Proprietors designated two baronies on the East Branch: Cypress Barony and Ashby Barony. Refer to chapter two for a larger discussion of baronies.
Cypress Barony

In 1681, Landgrave Thomas Colleton (b. >1715), second son of Proprietor Sir John Colleton (1608-1666), was granted Cypress Barony (Miles 2004:41; Smith 1900:328-329). In 1709, his son, Peter Colleton, sold the Barony to three Barbadian merchants (Hamer et al.1972:525). Over time, Cypress Barony resulted in eight separate plantations.

John Gough received thirty-five hundred acres and settled on the western portion of the Barony with his family. When John Gough died, his portion devised to his sons: John, Richard (d. 1752), Edward O’Neale (d. >1752), and Francis Gough (d. 1752) (BFP; O’Brien 1919:352). Gough’s portion became Kensington, Hyde Park, and St. James (aka Saw Mill) Plantations.

Michael Mahon, originally a native of Limerick, Ireland, received thirty-five hundred acres and named his portion of Cypress Barony after his native home: Limerick Plantation. In either late 1713 or 1714, after selling his portion of the Barony, Mahon returned to Barbados.

Dominick Arthur (d. >1714) received five thousand acres. In June 1714, he devised this portion of Cypress Barony to, and it vested in, his cousin, Christopher Arthur (d. 1724) (South Carolina Act #348; O’Brien 1919:352 and SCHGM 1914:122 identified Christopher Arthur as Dominick’s nephew). When Christopher Arthur (d. 1724) died (Last Will, Canterbury, England), he devised
his property to his Irish relatives. Limerick merchant Patrick Roche (d. 1739), son of his deceased uncle Francis Roche, inherited 1,886 acres; and Bartholomew Arthur, his nephew and son of Patrick Arthur (d. >1714), inherited 1,860 acres (Hawley 1946:4; SCHGM 1914:122; Smith 1911a:11). Executors of the Will included East Branch residents Captain John Harleston (1660-1738), John Ashby (1675-1727), Thomas Akin (1660-1705) and Patrick Roche (d. 1739) (SCHGM 1914:122). When Patrick Roche (d. 1739) died, he devised his acreage to his merchant son, Francis Roche (d. 1767) (Hawley 1946:5). Arthur’s portion became parts of Limerick, Silk Hope, Nicholson, Windsor, and Fishbrook Plantations.

**Ashby Barony**

The second Cassique John Ashby Jr. (1675-1727), of Quenby, Leicestershire, England received two proprietary grants for a two thousand-acre plantation located on the south side of the East Branch at “a place called by Indians Yadhaw” near a creek, first known as Ashby’s Creek then Quenby Creek (Ball 1929; Cross 1985:57; Irving 1842:72; Orvin 1973:25; Salley 1915:101, 142, 143, 192). John Ashby Jr. (1675-1727), conferred the name Quenby (variously spelled Quinby, Quemby, Quenby, Queenbie, or Queen Bee) after his ancestral home (Ball 1929; Irving 1842:72; Orvin 1973:25; Smith 1917a:6; Stoney 1932:165, 166). The Lowcountry spelling ‘Quinby’ is used for the purposes of this dissertation.
Ashby Jr. (1675-1727), a London merchant, amassed over five thousand acres. A discussion of Quinby Plantation appears later in this chapter.

**Group I: Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, Midway, and St. James**

Limerick Plantation was at the head of the northern branch, just north of Kensington Plantation. The original circa 1700 black cypress house burned in the 1920s (Miles 2004:73). Between 1709 and 1754, Limerick was the home seat of Daniel Huger II (1687-1754).

Next, Kensington Plantation lay between Limerick and Hyde Park Plantations. In 1817, Kensington Plantation contained one hundred eight acres, ninety-six of which were in order for cultivation (BFP). Historian Dr. John Beaufain Irving (1800-1881) owned Kensington Plantation in the mid-1800s (Miles 2004:67, 70). In the 1920s, a fire destroyed the original 1745 Kensington house (Miles 2004:70).

Just west of Kensington Plantation was Hyde Park Plantation. In 1817, Hyde Park contained one hundred fifteen acres of tideland, of which one hundred two acres was in cultivation, and four hundred twenty acres was of cleared pine highland (BFP). As early as 1742, John Coming Ball (1714-1764) built and settled upon Hyde Park Plantation when he married (Deas 1909:19). The first house at Hyde Park burned during the Revolutionary War and, in circa 1798, John Ball Sr. (1760-1817) of Kensington Plantation constructed the second Hyde
Park house as a ‘maroon’ house rather than a residence (Deas 1909:92-93, 131; Miles 2004:65). Ownership of Kensington Plantation merged with Hyde Park Plantation and the two plantations integrated during the Revolutionary War (Deas 1909:92-93). At his death, John Coming Ball (1714-1764) possessed nearly nine thousand acres of land, including two settled plantations; he inherited some of this land from his father and his first wife Catherine Gendron Ball (d. c.1753), and other lands he purchased (Bates and Leland 2015: 141; Deas 1909:72, 93, 95).

The next two plantations, Midway and St. James, were not a portion of Cypress Barony. Midway Plantation contained 2,421 acres of inland swamp and pine highland including bays and ponds (BFP; Smith 2012:209). It was the remnant of a large inland rice reserve linked to Gough Creek through Kensington Plantation at the midpoint of the public road between the forks of the Cooper River (Ball 1998:260; Deas 1909:133; NRHP 2002:22). From 1802-1810, Isaac Ball (1785-1825) managed Midway Plantation (BFP). In 1817, St. James Plantation contained 1,510 acres of inland swamp; highland with oak, hickory, and pine; and included bays and ponds (BFP). When John Ball Sr. (1760-1817) died, he owned seven plantations, including Kensington, Hyde Park, St. James (aka Saw Mill), and Midway Plantations on the East Branch (Ball 1998:260; BFP).
Limerick Plantation

In 1713, Dominick Arthur conveyed Limerick Plantation to French Huguenot émigré merchant-planter Daniel Huger I (1651-1711) for £800 in current South Carolina money (O’Brien 1926:212). In 1709, Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) purchased Limerick Plantation and made Limerick Plantation his place of residence (Bates and Leland 2015:183; Leiding 1921:84; Salley 1915:219). That same year Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) employed his son in law, Elie Horry (b. 1664/66) as the overseer for Limerick (Bates and Leland 2015:168). In 1737, Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) purchased three hundred twenty acres from John Gough’s sons - John Jr. and Richard Gough (d. 1752) (Smith 1911a:9). Between 1739 and 1741, Francis Roche (d. 1767) sold an additional eight hundred twenty-nine and one-half acres of Cypress Barony to Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) (Hawley 1946:5). Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) increased the acreage at Limerick Plantation to 4,564.5 acres.

Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) died at Limerick Plantation leaving two large estates on the East Branch, Limerick and Rice Hope Plantations, enslaved laborers, and five sons by his second wife Mary Cordes Huger (d. 1746), viz. Isaac (1743-1797), John (1744-1804), Benjamin (1746-1779), Francis (1751-1800), and Daniel III (1741-1799) (Smith 1911a:8). He devised these two plantations to his eldest son, twelve-year-old Daniel Huger III (1741-1799). Fellow French
Huguenots Gabriel Manigault (1704-1781), Elias Horry (1707-1783), Daniel Lesesne (1718-1782), and Thomas Cordes (1728-1763) served as his executors until the young Huger attained the age of nineteen. Witnesses to the Last Will were Elias Ball Sr. (1709-1786) and John Coming Ball (1714-1764) (SCHM 1914:92-94).


Elias Ball III (1752-1810), also known as Elias Ball Jr. and Ole Mas’ ‘Lias, became the first permanent Ball resident at Limerick Plantation (Ball 1998:217; Deas 1909:118, 123; Stoney 1932:176). A bachelor, Elias Ball III (1752-1810) managed other Ball family properties, including Comingtee Plantation, from Limerick Plantation until his death (BFP 1785-1809; Deas 1909; Lees 1978:68).

Elias Ball III (1752-1810) devised Limerick Plantation to his nephew, Isaac Ball (1785-1825), who operated the plantation until his death (Ball 1998:314; Lees...
Kensington Plantation

On March 22, 1740, Francis Gough (d. 1752), an heir of John Gough Sr., conveyed six hundred seventy acres to John Coming Ball (1714-1764) that became Kensington Plantation (Smith 1911a:9; Will Book 1747-1752:323). In 1764, John Coming Ball (1714-1764) devised Kensington Plantation to Elias Ball II (1709-1786). According to his Last Will dated 1772, Elias Ball II (1709-1786), who died at Kensington, devised it to his son, John Ball Sr. (1760-1817) (Deas 1909:87-88). When John Ball Sr. (1760-1817) died, his son, John Ball Jr. (1782-1834), purchased Kensington Plantation at auction (Ball 1998:263). A November 30, 1818 advertisement offered a description of the property:

Kensington Plantation, in St. John’s Parish on the Eastern Branch of Cooper River, which contained 108 acres of highland, cleared and wooded, this is a remarkably well settled Plantation, having thereon a two story double dwelling House, with every other building necessary and convenient. (Southern Patriot; quote in Miles 2004:70)

Hyde Park Plantation

In 1747, Richard Gough (d. 1752) as heir of his brother John Gough, conveyed six hundred acres to Elias Ball (Smith 1911a:10). It is possible that John Coming Ball (1714-1764) inherited Hyde Park from his father’s estate (Deas 1909:93, 95). In 1764, he devised Hyde Park Plantation to his son, Elias Ball (1744-
1822) and reserved a life estate for his widow, Judith Boisseau Ball (1725-1772), and all their children (Deas 1909:94, 100). Elias Ball (1744-1822), known as ‘Wambaw’ Elias, did not reside at Hyde Park Plantation, but rather at a nearby plantation he had inherited from his father, Wambaw Plantation in St. James Santee Parish, the former home seat of Daniel Huger I (1651-1711) (Deas 1909:100). Elias ‘Wambaw’ Ball (1744-1822) sided with the English during the Revolutionary War and received the moniker, Tory Elias Ball (Bates and Leland 2015:39, 141; Deas 1909:100-101). Towards the end of the Revolutionary War, Tory Elias Ball (1744-1822) moved his entire family to England and sold Hyde Park to his uncle, Elias Ball II (1709-1786); however, his stepmother, Judith Boisseau Ball (1725-1772), continued to live there until her death (Deas 1909:100-101).

Elias Ball II (1709-1786) died at Kensington Plantation and according to his 1772 Last Will, he devised Hyde Park Plantation to his son John Ball (1760-1817), except for a twenty-foot square “reserved as a Place of Family Sepulture for ever [sic]” (Deas 1909:87-88). When John Ball (1760-1817) died, his son, Isaac Ball (1785-1825) of Limerick Plantation, purchased Hyde Park Plantation at auction (Ball 1998:263). A November 30, 1818 advertisement noted that Hyde Park Plantation contained:
115 acres of highland, and wooded chiefly in Pine, this is also a remarkably well settled Plantation, having on it an excellent Tide Mill, which does as much execution as the most of the Mills built by Mr. Lucas, a small dwelling House, and every other building necessary for the Plantation. (*Southern Patriot*; quote in Miles 2004:65)

**St. James/Saw Mill Plantation**

In 1747, Edward O’Neale Gough (d. before 1752) and Francis Gough (d. 1752), the heirs of John Gough Sr. conveyed 1,910 aces to John Coming Ball (1714-1764) that became St. James/Saw Mill Plantation (Smith 1911a:9; Stoney 1932:181; Will Book 1747-1752:323). John Coming Ball (1714-1764) devised St. James Plantation to his son Elias Ball II (1709-1786) (Deas 1909:93). At that time, St. James Plantation contained only one thousand acres (Ball 1998:145). Ownership continued in the Ball family and followed the same trajectory as Kensington and Hyde Park Plantations.

**Midway Plantation**

In the early 1800s, John Ball Sr. (1760-1817) purchased Midway Plantation, which contained one hundred fifty acres (Ball 1998:260). By 1798, Midway Plantation contained 2,421 acres, surrounding a Carolina Bay (Schantz 1987:3-4; Smith 2012:209). Between 1802 and 1810, Isaac Ball (1785-1825) managed Midway Plantation for his father, John Ball Sr. (1760-1817) and, between 1805 and 1807, Isaac Ball (1785-1825) lived at Midway Plantation (BFP; Deas 1909:136; Smith

**Group II: Comingtee/Stoke, Fishpond, and Hut**

The first reference of the name Coming Tee appeared in the 1750 Last Will of Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) (Cross 1985:50). Comingtee was on the Cooper River at the ‘T’ where the river divides into the eastern and western branches. It was variously known as Coming’s T, Coming T, and Comingtee (Neuffer 1983:38). The name of the plantation derived from one of two origins. One account attributed the name to a village in Devonshire named Combe-in-Tene (Cross 1985:50; Miles 2004:41). Another account stated that the name was a combination of its first owner’s last name, Captain John Coming (d. 1694), and the T-shaped juncture of the two branches of the Cooper River (Miles 2004:41-42). From its inception, Comingtee Plantation consisted of two tracts: Comingtee and Stoke (Deas 1909:10). Stoke was named for the Ball’s English home, Stokentin Head (Deas 1909:10). Stoke contained Stoke Landing on the West Branch of Cooper River, barns, a boat house, rice processing structures, and an enslaved laborer settlement (Steen 2011:17). The initial grants of Comingtee Plantation included Fishpond Plantation, an uncleared tract about a mile to the east (Deas 1909:26). The next plantation, Hut Plantation, was thought to be a descriptive
name indicating a ‘hut-like’ structure on the plantation, contained one thousand acres (Neuffer 1973:9).

**Comingtee/Stoke Plantation**

In 1694, Affra Harleston Coming (c. 1651-1698), widow of John Coming (d. 1694) devised Comingtee Plantation, with the enslaved laborers and personal property, to her nephew John Harleston (c. 1660-1738) and her deceased husband’s step-nephew Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) (Deas 1909:31-32; Edgar 2006:211). Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751), arrived in Carolina either in late 1698 or early 1699 (Deas 1909:31, 33). In 1751, Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) devised Comingtee/Stoke Plantation to Elias Ball Sr. (1709-1786); after his death, the plantation devised to Elias (Ole Mas’ ‘Lias) Ball III (1752-1810) (Deas 1909:113). Elias Ball III (1752-1810) managed Comingtee Plantation while his brother, Isaac Ball (1754-1776), managed Limerick and Kensington Plantations. When Elias Ball III (1752-1810) died, he devised Comingtee/Stoke Plantation to his nephew, John Ball Jr. (1782-1834), who resided there until his death (Deas 1909:11, 20; Stoney 1932:177).

**Fishpond and Hut Plantations**

In 1708, John Harleston (c. 1660-1738) took possession of Fishpond Plantation, an uncleared tract about a mile east of Comingtee Plantation (Deas 1909:34). John Harleston (c. 1660-1738) continued to live at Comingtee Plantation
until the 1721 marriage of Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) and his second wife, Mary Delamare (1701-1751) (Ball 1998:97). On June 20, 1722, Elias Ball (1676-1751) pledged, “not to lay claim to any Land or parcel of Land now in the possession of John Harleston Esqr. & lying on that side the Creek where the said John Harleston now dwelleth [sic], on pretense of Purchase, or any other right which I now have, or at any time may have had to the said Land” (Deas 1909:43).

John Harleston (c.1660-1738) conveyed Fishpond to his son, Edward Harleston (1722-1775), who devised it to his son, John Harleston Jr. (1756-1783). John Harleston Jr. (1756-1783) divided the plantation into two tracts and sold both Fishpond and Hut Plantations to his cousins, Edward Harleston (1761-1825) and William Harleston (1757-1816), respectively (Deas 1909:18; Irving 1842:51; Stoney 1932:133). William Harleston (1757-1816) died at The Hut Plantation (Jervey 1902:161).

**Group III: Bonneau Ferry, Villa, Richmond, Farmfield, and Bossis**

This group of plantations was associated with Jacob Guérard (1660-1710). In 1679 before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Jacob Guérard (1660-1710) and Réné Petit, with the assistance of King Charles II, settled eighty French Huguenot families along the East Branch for the purpose of manufacturing silk oil and wine; Guérard and Petit received a grant for 4,000 acres each (Smith 1917b:111). In 1682, Samuel Wilson (*q.v.* Hagan Plantation) wrote:
The Countrey [sic] hath gently rising hills of fertile sand proper for Wines and further from the Sea Rock and gravel, on which very good grapes grow naturally, ripen well, and together, and very lushious [sic] in Taste, insomuch, that the French Protestants who are there and skilled in wine do no way doubt of producing great quantitys [sic], and very good. (Smith 1917b:110-111)

Known as the Guérard-Petit colony, they arrived aboard the national ship Richmond (Smith 1917b:110). In 1680, Guérard (also spelled Garrard, Girard) received a headright warrant for five hundred acres (Smith 1917b:111). Two years after Jacob Guérard’s arrival, his sons, John and Pierre Jacob Guérard, arrived in Charles Town. In 1681, a warrant was issued for four hundred twenty acres to Peter Jacob Gerrard [sic], Isack [sic] Guérard, John Guérard, Joseph Guérard, Margaret Guérard, and Elizabeth Guérard (Smith 1917b:111). In 1683, ‘Monsieur de la plane’, French Huguenot émigré Abraham Fleury de la Pleine, was issued a warrant for three hundred fifty acres and, in 1699, a headright warrant for two hundred acres (Smith 1917b:112; Salley 1915:160). It is possible that Fleury was part of the Guérard-Petit colony that arrived in 1680 on the Richmond (Bates and Leland 2015:117). Fleury resided in the French settlement at the headwaters of Goose Creek (Bates and Leland 2015:58, 117).

Bonneau Ferry Plantation took its name from the first Huguenot family who initially owned the property through several generations. The town of Bonneau was located where the road from the ferry came to the railroad. Eventually, the Harleston family owned Bonneau Ferry Plantation. The earliest
mention of the Villa Plantation, located on a landform defined by Mayrant’s Lead, was as ‘Gerard’s’ plantation (Irving 1842:53; Stoney 1932:141).

Richmond and Farmfield Plantations were located between Bonneau Ferry and Bossis Plantations. It is possible that Richmond Plantation was named after the vessel Richmond, in which the Guérard-Petit Colony arrived. Originally containing six thousand acres, Richmond Plantation became the home seat of Colonel John Harleston (1738-1793), eldest son of Nicholas Harleston (1710-1768) (Irving 1842:54; Stoney 1932:144). In 1900, the original Richmond Plantation house burned. The plantation contained an existing Harleston-Rutledge family cemetery with graves dating to 1793. Archaeological features associated with eighteenth and nineteenth century plantation included site of the original plantation house, early rice mill, earthworks, old rice fields and trunks, and enslaved laborer dwellings (Lowcountry Open Trust). A fragmentary map revealed that Farmfield Plantation contained five tracts that totaled 2,000 acres (Baldwin Papers, Box 195; Steen 2011:22). The five tracts listed were: (1) Tract A contained five hundred sixty acres granted in 1697 to Peter Guérard (GB NC:163); (2) Tract B, contained four hundred twenty acres granted in 1697 to Thomas Broughton (GB C:173); (3) Tract C contained three hundred forty-three acres granted to Peter Guérard (PG vol. 39:385-386); (4) Tract D contained five
hundred acres; and (5) Tract E contained two hundred acres granted in the 1690s to Jacob Guérard.

The next plantation is Bossis. Tradition holds that when the early settlers visited the Bosse Plantation, they referenced going to ‘Boss’s place’; thus, the name became Bossis (Irving 1842:70; Miles 2004:29; Stoney 1932:161). In 1736, either John Harleston (1660-1738) built the first house for eighteen-year-old Nicholas Harleston II (1710-1768) built the house at Bossis Plantation (Irving 1842:162; Miles 2004:29). Whether John Harleston (1660-1738) or his son Nicholas Harleston II (1710-1768) built the house, it burned in 1909; circa 1911, the house was rebuilt and was subsequently moved to Hopkins, near Columbia (Miles 2004:29).

**Bonneau Ferry Plantation**

About 1690, French Huguenot émigré Antoine Bonneau (1645-1700) and his wife Catherine DuBlis (de Bloys) (1660-1700) arrived in South Carolina with their sons, Antoine (1680-1743) and Jean Henri (b. 1682), who were born in France (Steen 2011:18). In 1671, Antoine Bonneau (1645-1700), was a resident of Martinique. Antoine Bonneau (1645-1700) purchased 3,020 acres from Nicholas Mayrant [Marrant]; in 1680, Nicholas Mayrant (1660-1724) (possibly the Anglicized version of Marrien or Marrient) arrived with the French Huguenot Guérard-Petit Colony and lived in the Orange Quarter (Bates and Leland
In 1700, when Antoine Bonneau (1645-1700) died, his sons, Samuel Bonneau (1725-1788) and Benjamin Bonneau (b. 1721) inherited 3,020 acres “including [Bonneau Ferry] Plantation … at the Ferry in St. John’s Parish” from their father and lived on this plantation before the Revolutionary War (Cross 1983:91; Irving 1842:51; Miles 2004:27). The ferry served the area plantations as a supply point for transporting goods to Charles Town (Miles 2004:28).


After Floride Bonneau Colhoun (1764-1836) died, Dr. Thomas Grimball Prioleau (1786-1876) acquired Bonneau Ferry Plantation (Irving 1842:51-52; Stoney 1932:133). In a nod to his Venetian ancestry, Dr. Thomas Grimball Prioleau (1786-1876) changed the name to Prioli Plantation (Cross 1983:92; Miles 2004:28; Stoney 1932:134).
**Villa (Harriett’s or Harriott’s) Plantation**

This property is possibly associated with one of the 1680 grants to John, David, and Benjamin Guérard (Steen 2011:20). Edward Harleston purchased the tract (Steen 2011:20; CCDB T9:448). When Edward Harleston (1722-1775) died, he devised Villa Plantation to his son, John Harleston (1756-1783). In 1783, when John Harleston Jr. (1756-1783) died, he devised Villa Plantation to his wife, Elizabeth Lynch Harleston (b. 1756). John Harleston Jr. (1756-1783) had died shortly after their marriage.

Elizabeth Lynch (b. 1756) was the daughter of Thomas Lynch Jr. (1727-1776) and Hannah Motte (1736-1805), his second wife, and stepdaughter of General William Moultrie (1730-1805), who was the state’s leading Revolutionary War hero and twice Governor (Edgar 2006:649). General William Moultrie’s (1730-1805) second wife was Hannah Motte Lynch (1736-1805) (Edgar 2006:249). In 1784, Elizabeth Lynch Harleston (b. 1756) married James Hamilton Sr. (1750-1833) (Irving 1842:53; Stoney 1932:141). Their son, James Hamilton Jr. (1786-1857) was Charleston’s Intendant during the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy (*q.v.* chapter three).

In the 1780s, Colonel Daniel Huger Horry Jr. (1737-1785) purchased Villa Plantation (Irving 1842:53; Stoney 1932:141). Colonel Daniel Huger Horry Jr. (1737-1785) changed the name to Harriott’s (Harriett’s) Villa in honor of his wife,

**Richmond and Farmfield Plantations**

Either in 1730, Nicholas Harleston (1710-1768) purchased the property from Dr. Jacob Martine, a French Huguenot or, in 1769, Colonel John Harleston (1738-1793) purchased Richmond Plantation (CCDB W:326; Irving 1842:55-56; Steen 2011:21; Stoney 1932:144-45). Perhaps, John inherited the properties from his father.

When Colonel John Harleston (1738-1793) and his wife Elizabeth Faucheraud Harleston (1749-1805) died, there was a division of the property. Richmond Plantation transferred to their daughter Jane Smith Harleston Rutledge (1773-1835) (Bailey 1989; Irving 1842:57; Roberts 1965:1; Stoney 1932:145). Jane Smith Harleston Rutledge (1773-1835) married Edward Rutledge
(1770-1811), the son of Governor John Rutledge (1749-1800) and brother of Frederick Wilkes Rutledge (1769-1821).

Richmond Plantation’s next legal owner was twenty-six-year-old Nicholas Harleston Rutledge (1809-1835), son of Jane Smith Harleston Rutledge (1773-1835) and Edward Rutledge (1767-1811) (Bailey 1989; Miles 2004:99; Stoney 1932:145). In 1835, Nicholas Harleston Rutledge (1809-1835) devised Richmond Plantation to Sarah Hasell Harleston Huger (1800-1865), daughter of William Harleston (1757-1816) and Sarah Quash Harleston (1773-1821) and the granddaughter of John Harleston (1738-1793) (Roberts 1965:1; Stoney 1932:45). Sarah Hasell Harleston Huger (1800-1865) married Dr. Benjamin Huger (1793-1874).

In 1835, Nicholas Harleston Rutledge (1809-1835) devised Farmfield Plantation to Elizabeth Harleston Corbett (1770-1837), who married merchant Thomas Corbett (1770-1850); she was the daughter of Colonel John Harleston (1738-1793) and his wife Elizabeth Faucheraud Harleston (1749-1805) (Bailey 1989; Irving 1842:57; Roberts 1965:1; Stoney 1932:145). Thomas Corbett’s (1770-1850) parents were Thomas Corbett (1743-1850) and Margaret Harleston Corbett (1749-1819); he was also the grandfather of Dr. John Beaufain Irving, who grew up at Farmfield Plantation (Steen 2011:22).
**Bossis Plantation**

Initially, the Proprietors awarded three grants. In 1704, Michael Bosse and Richard Blake received a grant for five hundred sixty-five acres. In 1705, Richard Blake received an additional grant of one hundred ninety-five acres adjoining his other acreage. In 1705, Robert Quattlebaum received a grant for five hundred forty acres. In 1732, John Guérard combined the three tracts, which contained 1,285 acres, and sold them to immigrant John Harleston (1660-1738) (Irving 1842:162; Steen 2011:24). John Harleston (1660-1738) devised the plantation to his son, Nicholas Harleston II (1710-1768) (Irving 1842:162).

When Nicholas Harleston II (1710-1768) died, he devised Bossis Plantation to his son, Colonel John Harleston (1738-1793) (Irving 1842:161). When Nicholas Harleston II (1710-1768) died, his wife, Ann Ashby Harleston (b.1728), gave birth six months after his death to a son, Nicholas Posthumous Harleston (1768-1832). When Nicholas came of age, John Harleston (1738-1793) presented the plantation to his younger half-brother Nicholas Posthumous Harleston (1768-1832) (Irving 1842:70; Stoney 1932:161-162). Nicholas Posthumous Harleston (1768-1832) owned Bossis until his death in 1832 (Irving 1842:70; Stoney 1932:162).

**Group IV: Windsor, Fishbrook, and Silk Hope**

St. John’s Berkeley, St. Thomas, and St. James Santee Parishes met at a corner of Windsor Plantation (Leiding 1921:94). A tract of seven hundred eighty
acres that was once Dominick Arthur’s (d. 1714) portion of Cypress Barony became Fishbrook Plantation (Irving 1842:79; Stoney 1932:180). Fishbrook Plantation was the family seat of the Quash family. Although only a small portion of Arthur’s property became a portion of Silk Hope Plantation, only two families, the Johnsons and the Manigaults, owned Silk Hope Plantation proper from its inception into the late nineteenth century. When Gabriel Manigault (1704-1781) acquired all Johnson property, Silk Hope became Manigault’s Barony (Orvin 1973:25; Smith 1917a:13).

**Windsor Plantation**

Francis Roche (d. 1767) lived on his remaining 1,150 acres known as Windsor Plantation (Hawley 1946:5; Smith 1911a:11). When Francis Roche (d. 1767) died, he devised Windsor Plantation to his son, Ebenezer Roche (1744-1783) (Irving 1842:80; Smith 1911a:11; Stoney 1932:181, 183). In 1784, Ebenezer Roche’s (1744-1783) executors, Francis (b. 1753) and Thomas Roche, conveyed Windsor Plantation to Edward Harleston (1761-1825), reserving a one-half acre enclosure for future burials of Ebenezer Roche’s (d. 1783) descendants (Hawley 1946:5; Leiding 1921:85; Smith 1911a:11; Stoney 1932:183). Two years later, in 1786, Edward Harleston (1761-1825) moved to Fishpond Plantation and transferred Windsor Plantation to Joseph Brown (d. >1806) from Georgetown (Hawley 1946:5). In 1784, Joseph Brown (d. >1806) married Harriet Lowndes
(1765-1852), the daughter of South Carolina Governor Rawlins Lowndes (1720-1800) \textit{(South Carolina Gazette)}. In 1788, Joseph Brown (d. >1806) transferred Windsor Plantation to Major Evan Edwards (1752-1798) (Hawley 1946:5; Irving 1842:80; Orvin 1973:135; Smith 1911a:11; Stoney 1932:184).

After his military career in Pennsylvania, Major Evan Edwards (1752-1798) retired to Charleston. Major Edwards (1752-1798) married Catherine Jones (1785- >1840) and they named their daughter Harriet Lowndes Edwards (1796-1855). The daughter’s first and middle name was an indication of a close family relationship with Joseph (d. >1806) and Harriet Lowndes Brown (1765-1852). After her husband’s death, Catherine Jones Edwards (1785->1840) owned Windsor Plantation until the late 1830s (Leiding 1921:85; Smith 1911:10). In 1840, Dr. John Beaufain Irving (1800-1881) purchased Windsor Plantation from the estate of Catherine Jones Edwards (1785->1840) (Smith 2012:223).

However, Ball family records stated that in the early nineteenth century, Henry (1787-1824) and Elizabeth Ann Poyas (1792-1877) owned Windsor Plantation (Ball 1998:120). The Poyas and Ball families were interrelated. Henry Poyas (1787-1824) was the grandson of Elizabeth Ball Smith (1746-1787), who was the granddaughter of Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751). In 1811, Henry’s sister, Eliza Catharine Poyas (1794-1867) married Isaac Ball (1785-1825) (Ball 1998:120, 263). Subsequently, Eliza Catharine Poyas Ball (1794-1867) and Isaac
Ball (1785-1825) raised their seven-year-old nephew, James Poyas (1806-1850), the son of Henry (1787-1824) and Elizabeth Poyas (1792-1877) of Windsor Plantation (Ball 1998:120).

**Fishbrook Plantation**

One historical source stated that in 1735, Bartholomew Arthur sold 1,361 acres to Dr. Robert Broûn (1714-1759) who then sold the tract to Thomas Wright (Smith 1911a:12). However, in 1735, Bartholomew Arthur sold 1,880 acres to Robert Quash (1700-1772) and Dr. Robert Brown [sic] (1714-1759) (Smith 2012:9). In 1735, at the age of twenty-one, Scotsman Dr. Robert Broûn (1714-1759) arrived in Carolina with his father, mother, and brother, William, who moved on to Virginia. In 1738, Dr. Robert Broûn (1714-1759) married Elizabeth Thomas (1722-1766) and established Brounfields Plantation in St. James Goose Creek (Heitzler 2012). His descendants intermarried with the Huger and Deas families on the East Branch.

Under his Last Will, Christopher Arthur devised five hundred acres to his son Bartholomew Arthur who sold the tract to Robert Quash (1700-1772) (Will Book P:1). Between 1742 and 1757, Thomas Wright transferred three tracts totaling 1,361 acres to Robert Quash (1700-1772) (Smith 1911a:12). Quash (1700-1772) unified the original Bartholomew Arthur tract plus added one hundred fifty-four acres of wetland from Gabriel Manigault’s (1704-1791) Silk Hope

**Silk Hope Plantation**

In 1683, Sir Nathaniel Johnson (1644-1713) received a warrant to lay out five hundred sixty acres “for the transportation into this province of thirteen servants” (Smith 1917a:12; Hawley 1946:8). In 1686, Sir Nathaniel Johnson (1644-1713) became a Cassique with rights to two baronies (Edgar 2006:504; Smith 1903:34-53; Smith 1911b:111; Salley 1915:134). In 1689, while Governor of the Leeward Islands, Johnson wrote “I design as speedily as possible to move to Carolina, where I have a small settlement, and to spend some time in the improvement of it for the support of myself and family” (Smith 1911b:112). In the same year, Silk Hope Plantation, which contained 5,518 acres, became Sir Nathaniel Johnson’s (1644-1713) home seat (Edgar 2006:505-506; Smith 1917a:12-
In 1696, the Proprietors issued Johnson another grant for 1,940 acres on the East Branch of Cooper River at a place called ‘Silk Hope’ (Smith 1911b:112).

When Sir Nathaniel Johnson (1644-1713) died, he devised Silk Hope Plantation to his son Robert Johnson (1676-1735) of Kemblesworth, Durham, England (Smith 1917a:13). Both father and son served as Proprietary Governors of South Carolina; Nathaniel served from 1703 to 1709 and Robert served from 1717-1719 and as Royal Governor from 1730 to 1735 (Edgar 2006:504-405). When Robert Johnson (1676-1735) died, he devised Silk Hope to his sons: (1) 4,570 acres to Robert Johnson (b. 1728), (2) 4,570 acres to Nathaniel Johnson, and (3) 2,860 acres to Thomas Johnson (b. 1730) (Will Book 1732-1737:187). While still under the age of majority, young Nathaniel Johnson died shortly after his father; his brothers Robert (b. 1728) and Thomas (b. 1730) split his share. Thomas Johnson (b. 1730) conveyed his 5,145 acres to his brother, Robert Johnson (b. 1728). In 1739, Robert Johnson (b. 1728) conveyed several tracts, that totaled 6,855 acres to Gabriel Manigault (CCDB T:248). In 1763, Robert Johnson (b. 1728) conveyed the remainder of the Barony, containing 5,145 acres to Gabriel Manigault (CCDB 43:99).

the time of his marriage, Manigault (1704-1781), a planter, merchant, legislator, and private banker, was the third richest man in the country (Dusinberre 2000:4; Miles 2004:76). It was said about his character that, Manigault “so abhorred the slave trade that he refused to lend money to those involved” although he himself owned two hundred eighty-nine enslaved laborers (Edgar 2006:585; Miles 2004:76). When Gabriel Manigault (1704-1781) died during the Revolutionary War, he devised Silk Hope Plantation to his grandsons, Joseph (1763-1843) and Gabriel Manigault II (1758-1809) (Smith 1911b:116). In a 1788-partition of several properties inherited by the two brothers, Gabriel Manigault II (1758-1809), the Gentleman Architect, acquired Silk Hope Plantation (Edgar 2006:586).

On March 5, 1805, Gabriel Manigault II (1758-1809) moved to Philadelphia and conveyed 3,500 acres including the rice lands, buildings, and settlement to his brother-in-law Nathaniel Heyward (1766-1851), who was one of the wealthiest men in South Carolina (Edgar 2006:586; Irving 1842:74; Smith 1917a:13; Stoney 1932:169). In 1788, Nathaniel Heyward (1766-1851) married Henrietta Manigault (1769-1827) (Edgar 2006:440). His extensive land holdings included several town lots in Charles Town and more than thirty-five thousand acres in Beaufort, Charleston, and Colleton Counties; on the East Branch were Silk Hope, Club House, and Pompion Hill Plantations (Edgar 2006:440). In 1825, Silk Hope Plantation returned to the Manigault family (Dusinberre 2000:4).
Group V: Quinby, Middleburg, Pompion Hill, Simons Ville, Horts/Halidon Hill, Smokey Hill, and Camp Vere

Quinby Plantation was opposite Bossis Plantation and adjacent to Pompion Hill Plantation. Quenby was variously spelled Quinby, Quemby, Quenby, Queenbie, or Queen Bee (Ball 1929; Irving 1842:72; Orvin 1973:25; Smith 1917a:6; Stoney 1932:165, 166). The second Cassique John Ashby Jr. (1675-1727) from Quenby, Leicestershire, England received two proprietary grants for a two thousand-acre Barony that became Quenby Plantation (Cross 1985:57; Irving 1842:72; Orvin 1973:25). During the Revolutionary War, Quinby Plantation became Shubrick’s Plantation (Irving 1842:73; Stoney 1932:165). In 1781, a Revolutionary War battle occurred at Quinby Bridge near the plantation where British soldiers, under Colonel Coates, sought refuge and fought American forces under the command of General Thomas Sumter; the bodies of the deceased soldiers remained buried near the road (Ashby n.d.; Edgar 2006:240; SCDAH). Either the Pinckney or the Shubrick family constructed the nineteenth century house at Quinby Plantation (Gilchrist n.d.). In 1954, the owners moved the house four miles to Halidon Hill Plantation (formerly a portion of Middleburg Plantation); the foundation remained at Quinby Plantation (Miles 2004:59).

West of Quinby Plantation was Pompion Hill Plantation, which contained 1,540 acres in five adjoining tracts. The first name associated with this land is
Pierre Fouré, which Smith (1917b:113) speculated could possibly be a misspelling of Fleury. However, Bates and Leland (2015:310) identified Fouré and Fleury as different families. Next to Pompion Hill Plantation “on a high bluff, rising abruptly from the bed of the river, stands the Parish Chapel, commonly known as Pompion Hill Chapel taking its name from the hill on which it stands” (Converse 2011:11; Edgar 2006:741-742; Irving 1842:67; Smith 1917a:21; Stoney 1932:157). After 1823 and during Alfred Huger’s (1788-1872) ownership, Pompion Hill Plantation became Longwood Plantation (Smith 1917a:20).

South of Pompion Hill Plantation was Middleburg Plantation. One of the original French Huguenot émigrés, Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717), settled on East Branch in the late seventeenth century at Middleburg Plantation, which he named after the ancient capital of the province of Zeeland, Holland. The original house, erected circa 1697, considered the oldest frame dwelling in South Carolina remains today (Miles 2004:79). Other current buildings include the ruins of the former rice mill and steam engine built by Jonathan Lucas (Miles 2004:79). Four plantations derived from the initial grant: Middleburg, Simons Ville (Horts or Halidon Hill), Smoky Hill, and Camp Vere Plantations. Simons Ville became Horts Plantation, which contained seven hundred sixty-eight acres and included riverfront acreage with some pineland (Ball 1929:5; Miles 2004:63). In 1843, Horts Plantation became Halidon Hill Plantation (Miles 2004:59). The name was
attributed to either the 1333 Battle of Halidon Hill on the border of Scotland and England or an 1822-book written by Sir Walter Scott (Ball 1929:5). On this tract is a rice reserve called Logmore, which is a corruption of Longuemare who first owned this portion (Bates and Leland 2015:226). Camp Vere Plantation derived its name from a small village in Holland, near Middleburg. It was variously spelled Campveer or Kampveer, as well as Camp Vere. Originally, the plantation was named Champs Vert or ‘green fields’ in French (Community and Neighborhood Names 1965).

**Quinby Plantation**

In 1726, John Ashby (1675-1727), a widower with a son, married sixteen-year-old Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball (1711-1746), the daughter of Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (Deas 1909:58-61); their marriage was short-lived. Shortly after John Ashby (1675-1727) died, Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball Ashby (1711-1746) entered into a marriage with merchant John Vicaridge (Deas 1909:58-61, 178). Before their marriage, Elizabeth’s family drew up a pre-nuptial agreement that prevented Vicaridge from taking possession of any and all property Elizabeth inherited from John Ashby (1675-1727) (Anzilotti 2002:176). Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball Ashby Vicaridge (1711-1746) outlived her second husband. In 1740, she brought Quinby Plantation into her third marriage to merchant Richard Shubrick (1707-1765) (Deas 1909:60). When Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball Ashby Vicaridge Shubrick (1711-1746) died, Richard
Shubrick (1707-1765) returned to England with their young son Richard Shubrick (1741->1792).

At this point, there is some confusion about the transfer of Quinby Plantation. Apparently, there were two Richard and two Thomas Shubricks. Elizabeth’s husband Richard Shubrick (1707-1765) had a brother named Thomas Shubrick (1711-1779), who had a son also named Thomas Shubrick (1756-1810). Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball Vicaridge Shubrick (1711-1746) and Richard Shubrick (1707-1765) had a son also named Richard Shubrick (1741->1792).

Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball Vicaridge Shubrick (1711-1746) and Richard Shubrick (1707-1765) devised Quinby Plantation to their nephew, Richard Shubrick (1751-1777). Perhaps Captain Richard Shubrick (1751-1777), Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball Ashby Vicaridge Shubrick’s (1711-1746) nephew, conveyed Quinby Plantation to his father, the elder Thomas Shubrick (1711-1779), who devised the plantation to his son Colonel Thomas Shubrick (1756-1810) (Smith 1917a:8). On July 27, 1792, Colonel Thomas Shubrick (1756-1810) conveyed Quinby Plantation, which contained 1,203 acres, to planter-lawyer Roger Pinckney (1770-1851) for £2500 sterling (Ball 1929:2; Orvin 1973:25; Smith 1917a:8; Irving 1842:73 and Stoney 1932:166 following Irving, dated the property transfer in 1802). Roger Pinckney (1770-1851) was not a member of the famous Pinckney family.
In 1815, Roger Pinckney (1770-1851) conveyed Quinby Plantation to trustees to pay his creditors. On March 21, 1816, the trustees conveyed the property to Isaac Ball (1785-1825), whose descendants owned it until 1860 (Ball 1929:2; Smith 1917a:9). Other sources, however, stated that Roger Pinckney (1770-1851) sold Quinby Plantation to John Ball (1760-1817), who bought it for his son, Isaac Ball (1785-1825) of Limerick Plantations (Irving 1842:73; Stoney 1932:166). Nevertheless, upon Isaac Ball’s (1785-1825) death, he devised Quinby Plantation to his daughter, Jane Ball Shoolbred (1823-1905) (Ball 1929:2, 314).

**Pompion Hill/Longwood Plantation**

The first mention of ownership was in 1686 when French Huguenot émigré Pierre Fouré transferred a tract in this area to Pierre de St. Julien de Malacare (Bates and Leland 2015:310; Smith 1917a:19, 113; Miles 2004:74). Pierre Fouré, a merchant, could purchase property, but could not inherit or pass property to his heirs and he had no political rights (Bates and Leland 2015:310).

In 1685/6, French Huguenot émigré Nicholas de Longuemare (d. c.1699), a silversmith and watchmaker, received a warrant for one hundred acres near Fouré’s land and French Huguenot émigré Josias DuPré (1640-1712), a merchant, received a grant adjacent to de Longuemare’s land (Bates and Leland 2015:225-226, 357; Smith 1917a:113). Eventually, Pompion Hill Plantation derived from five tracts: one hundred forty acres from DuPré, two hundred acres from DuPré
and Hartly, another two hundred acres from DuPré heirs, and a combined four hundred sixty-two acres and five hundred eighteen acres from Benjamin Simons II (1613-1772) of Middleburg Plantation (Miles 2004:74).

In 1694, French Huguenot émigré merchant Josias DuPré (1640-1712) and Martha Brabant DuPré (b. 1648) conveyed sixty acres to David Hartly (Smith 1917a:18). In 1702, Josias DuPré (1640-1712) received a grant for land in the Orange Quarter “bounding North west on the eastern branch of the Cooper River.” In 1703, Josias DuPré (1640-1712) was granted an additional seven hundred thirty acres. In 1711, Josias DuPré (1640-1712) and Martha Brabant DuPré (b. 1648) conveyed one hundred forty acres to Reverend Thomas Hasell (1685-1744) (Smith 1917a:18, 19). In 1723, Cornelius DuPré (1680-1747), planter, and his wife Jeanne Elizabeth Brabant DuPré (d. 1748) as heirs of Josias DuPré (1640-1712) made a two-hundred-acre conveyance to Reverend Thomas Hasell (1685-1744) (Smith 1917a:19). Also, in 1723, John Strahan (d. 1743) and Elizabeth Strahan conveyed two hundred acres to Reverend Thomas Hasell (1685-1744) (Smith 1917a:19).

Reverend Thomas Hasell (1685-1744) combined the 1694-Hartley and 1711-DuPré conveyances into one tract of two hundred acres. Reverend Thomas Hasell (1685-1744) married Elizabeth Ashby (1690-1746), sister of John Ashby (1675-1727), and was rector for St. Thomas Parish for thirty-five years (Neuffer
When the Reverend Hasell (1685-1744) died, he devised 1,540 acres to his eldest son, Thomas Hasell (1717-1756) (Smith 1917a:20). Three years later, Thomas Hasell (1717-1756) conveyed 1,127 acres to his brother John Hasell (1723-1752), who sold it, in 1750, to his brother-in-law Samuel Thomas (1719-1772) (Smith 1917a:20). Samuel Thomas’ (1719-1772) third wife was Ann Hasell (1736-1767), daughter of Reverend Thomas Hasell (1685-1744) and Elizabeth Ashby Hasell (1690-1746).

In 1750, Samuel Thomas (1719-1772) purchased two tracts, totaling nine hundred eighty acres, which was originally a part of Middleburg Plantation and belonged to Benjamin Simons II (1713-1772) (Smith 1917a:19). On December 5, 1750, under the ownership of Samuel Thomas (1719-1772), the plantation became property of St. Thomas Parish and vested in the Vestry (Irving 1842:69; Stoney 1932:160). No extant records confirmed this (Smith 1917a:20). When Samuel Thomas (1719-1772) died, he devised Pompion Hill Plantation, which contained 1,540 acres, to his son, Samuel Thomas (b. 1748).

On June 15, 1784, the Vestry of St. Thomas sold the property to Colonel Thomas Shubrick (1756-1810) (Irving 1842:69-70; Smith 1917a:20; Stoney 1932:160). In 1790, Colonel Thomas Shubrick (1756-1810), mortgaged Pompion Hill Plantation to his cousin Richard Shubrick (1741->1792) (Smith 1917a:20). On March 20, 1791, Colonel Thomas Shubrick (1756-1810), as executor of his father’s
estate, conveyed nine hundred ninety-one acres to William Barnett (Smith 1917a:20).

Between 1791 and 1805, William Barnett transferred the plantation to Gabriel Manigault (1758-1809) (Irving 1842:70; Smith 1917a:20; Stoney 1932:160). On March 5, 1805, Gabriel Manigault (1758-1809) transferred nine hundred ninety-one acres known as Pompion Hill Plantation and five hundred acres (actually it was three hundred thirty-six acres) known as the ‘Club House’ tract to his brother-in-law, Nathaniel Heyward (1766-1851) (Irving 1842:70; Smith 1917a:20; Stoney 1932:160). In 1823, Nathaniel Heyward (1766-1851) conveyed Pompion Hill Plantation and Club House tract to Alfred Huger (1788-1872), son of John Huger (1738-1805) the owner of Hagan Plantation (Irving 1842:70; Smith 1917a:20; Stoney 1932:160).

**Pompion Hill Chapel**

Built with liberal assistance from Sir Nathaniel Johnson (1644-1713) and private subscriptions, the chapel rests on ten to twelve acres with a road leading from the public road directly to the door (Edgar 2006:741-742; Smith 1917a:20-21). The first church, made of cypress, was built in 1703 (Irving 1842:67; Stoney 1932:157). The present brick edifice dates from 1763 and still stands today (Edgar 2006:741; Neuffer 1983:141)! This chapel served Huguenot families who converted to Anglicanism.
Middleburg Plantation

In 1685, French Huguenot émigré Nicholas de Longuemare (d. c. 1699) received a warrant for one hundred acres that will become Halidon Hill (Bates and Leland 2015:226; Smith 1917a:22). In 1697, Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717) was issued a warrant for one hundred acres (Salley 1915:146; Smith 1917a:22). In 1704, Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717) received a grant for three hundred fifty acres (CCDB EE:212; Smith 1917a:22). The 1,545 acres included one hundred acres granted in 1693/4 to Nicholas Longuemare (d. c.1699), two hundred twenty of the three hundred acres granted in 1703 to fellow French Huguenot immigrant Jean Aunant (d. c.1707) (a silk thrower), three hundred fifty acres granted in 1704 to Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717), and eight hundred seventy-five acres of one thousand acres granted in 1705 to Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717) (Bates and Leland 2015:226, 357; Salley 1915:178, 194; Smith 1917a:22). Josias DuPré (1640-1712) and Martha Brabant DuPré (b. 1648) raised young Benjamin Simons (1672-1717), whose first wife was his cousin and daughter of his benefactors, Marie Esther DuPré (1674-1737).

When Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717) died, all of his property consisting of 1,545 acres devised to his four-year-old son, Benjamin Simons II (1713-1772) (Smith 1917a:22). When Benjamin Simons II (1713-1772) died, he devised the
extensive property containing 1,659 acres to his son, Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789).

In 1785, Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789) separated a tract, which contained seven hundred forty-three and one-half acres from Middleburg Plantation. When Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789) died, Middleburg Plantation was resurveyed and contained 2,598.5 acres (Smith 1917a:22). Simmons III (1736-1789) also owned The Grove Plantation near Seewee Bay (Smith 1917a:22). Middleburg Plantation was partitioned among his three daughters. Sarah Lydia Simons Lucas (1782-1834), who married millwright and inventor Jonathan Lucas II (1775-1832), received Middleburg Plantation, which contained the settlement and seven hundred seventy-four waterfront acres (Edgar 2006:573; Smith 1917a:23). Jonathan Lucas I (1754-1821) immigrated to Carolina in 1786 and was successful in building several rice mills; Jonathan Lucas II (1775-1832) and Jonathan Lucas III (b. 1800) continued in the rice mill industry (Edgar 2006:573).

**Simons Ville/Horts (Halidon Hill) Plantation**

The former portion of Middleburg Plantation, designated Simons Ville, became Horts Plantation when Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789) devised seven hundred sixty-eight acres to his daughter Catherine Simons Hort (1773-1800), who became the second wife of Barbadian William Hort (1749-1826) (Ball 1929:5; Miles 2004:63; Smith 1917a:23). In 1827, the Horts conveyed Horts Plantation to
Colonel John Bryan (1791-1848), son of Lydia Ball Simons Bryan (1757-1843) and her second husband John Bryan (1754-1805). In 1843, William James Ball (1821-1891) of Limerick Plantation changed the name to Halidon Hill when he purchased the property (Ball 1929:5; CCDB L11:124; Miles 2004:59).

**Smokey Hill Plantation**

Benjamin Simons’ III (1736-1789) third daughter, Mary Simons Maybank (1777-1806), who married David Maybank (1767-1806), received the remaining portion of Middleburg Plantation, which contained 1,056 acres of inland rice land and pineland (Smith 1917a:22; Stoney 1932:155). David Maybank’s (1767-1806) father Joseph Maybank (1735-1783) married Hester Bonneau (1740-1781) the daughter of Peter Bonneau (1710-1748) of Bonneau Ferry Plantation. In 1824, the Maybank’s children conveyed Smokey Hill Plantation to Colonel John Bryan (1791-1848) (CCDB O9:255; Smith 1917a:23).

**Camp Vere Plantation**

In 1785, Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789) separated a tract named Camp Vere, which contained seven hundred forty-three and one-half acres from Middleburg Plantation (Irving 1842:53; NR 2002:15; Smith 1917a:23; Stoney 1932:140). Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789) sold Camp Vere Plantation to his sister-in-law Lydia Ball Simons Bryan’s (1757-1843) second husband, John Bryan (1754-1805) who settled at Camp Vere Plantation (Deas 1909:87; Irving 1842:53;
Lydia Ball Simons Bryan’s (1757-1843) first husband was Edward ‘Ned’ Simons (1743-1775), a country factor in Charleston in partnerships with his brother Maurice Simons (1744-1785) and the brother of Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789). When John Bryan (1754-1805) died, either Lydia Ball Simons Bryan (1757-1843) inherited Camp Vere Plantation (Ball 1998:259) or their son, John Bryan inherited it (CCPCB D:429; Smith 1917a:23).

**Group VI: Blessing, Cedar Hill and Cherry Hill**

Extending along the river as far as Camp Vere Plantation was a “place called Mattesaw also the Blessing”, on the south side of the East Branch (Smith 1917a:24; Stoney 1932:135). In 1669, Irish immigrant Jonack ‘Jonah’ Lynch (1656-1691) arrived on the Proprietor’s ship the *Blessing* and he subsequently named his grant after the ship (Smith 1917a:24). Between 1785 and 1791, Archibald Broün (1752-1797) divided Blessing Plantation into three plantations: Blessing, Cedar Hill, and Cherry Hill; and, in 1791, he rearranged the boundaries of these three plantations, thereby altering the acreage of Cedar Hill and Cherry Hill Plantations (Irving 1842:52).

**Blessing Plantation**

In 1682, Jonack ‘Jonah’ Lynch (1650-1691) received a proprietor’s grant for seven hundred eighty acres on the river near a large creek (Anonymous 1954; Miles 2004: 26; PG 38:63; Smith 1917a:24-25; Stoney 1932:135). Initially known as
Wisboo or Wis-boo-e, then Lynch Creek, the name changed to French Quarter Creek (Smith 1917a:24). Lynch’s grant was northwest of a seventy-acre grant made in 1681 to Elizabeth Willis, the wife of immigrant John Harleston (c. 1660-1738), of Fishpond Plantation (Smith 1911:156, 1917a:23). Lynch’s (1656-1691) second wife was Margaret Johnson (b. 1665), daughter of Sir Nathaniel Johnson (1644-1713) of Silk Hope Plantation.

Jonack ‘Jonah’ Lynch (1656-1691) devised his grant to his eldest son Johnson Lynch (1673-1712) (Smith 1917a:25). Johnson Lynch (1673-1712) received three grants for a total of twelve hundred acres: (1) in 1700, four hundred acres warranted to his father and (2) two warrants in 1711, three hundred five hundred acres each (PG 38:375, 39:105-106; Salley 1915:126, 237; Smith 1917a:25). In 1709, Johnson Lynch (1673-1712) sold one hundred acres to John Blake (Smith 1917a:25). Thereafter, Johnson Lynch (1673-1712) died and left the remaining eleven hundred acres to his widow Susannah Margaret Schulte Lynch (1675-1711) and his two daughters, Mary Lynch Robert (d. 1812) and Margaret Lynch Horry (1707-1785) (Smith 1917a:25). Both daughters lived in St. James, Santee (Bates and Leland 2015:171-172, 302). Mary married French Huguenot Captain Pierre ‘Peter’ Robert III (1704-1740) and Margaret married French Huguenot Colonel Elias Horry II (1707-1783). In 1732, Peter Robert III (1704-1740)
advertised the sale of the Blessing with “1000 acres, containing Extraordinary good Corn and Rice Land…” (Bates and Leland 2015:302).

In 1733, Susannah Margaret Schulte Lynch (1675-1711) and daughters conveyed eleven hundred acres to Antoine Bonneau (1645-1700) of Bonneau Ferry Plantation who transferred the tract to his son Peter Bonneau (1698-1748) (Bates and Leland 2015:302; Smith 1917a:25). The first wife of Peter Bonneau (1698-1748) was Esther Simons (1719-1760), the granddaughter of Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717).

The records are silent about the transfer between Bonneau and Deas (Smith 1917a:25). By 1760, merchant John Deas Sr. (1735-1790), a Scot immigrant, owned Blessing plantation, which contained eleven hundred acres (Smith 1917a:25). In 1770, John Deas Sr. (1735-1790) added one hundred thirty acres granted in 1697 to French Huguenot émigré Abel Bochet (d. between 1708 and 1711); and, in 1775, Deas Sr. added one hundred acres granted in 1700 to French Huguenot émigré Georges Juin (CCDB Q3:111, G5:218; Bates and Leland 2015:50-51; Smith 1917a:25). As stated previously, John Deas Sr. (1735-1790) divided Blessing Plantation into three plantations: Blessing, Cedar Hill, and Cherry Hill (Irving 1842:52). In 1785, John Deas Sr. (1735-1790) conveyed the eastern part, adjoining Camp Vere Plantation, to his son, John Deas Jr. (d. 1790); this part remained Blessing Plantation (CCDB Q5:425; Smith 1917a:25). John Deas Sr. and
Jr. died in the same year. In 1789, John Deas Jr. (d. 1790) conveyed Blessing Plantation, which contained six hundred thirty-one acres, to his brother-in-law, Archibald Broûn (1752-1797) (CCDB B6:428; Smith 1917a:25-26).

Archibald Broûn (1752-1797), son of immigrant Dr. Robert Broûn (1714-1759), who purchased Fishbrook Plantation and Elizabeth Thomas Broûn (1722-1766), married Mary Deas (1762-1857). Elizabeth Thomas (1722-1766) was the sister of Samuel Thomas (1719-1772), of Pompion Hill Plantation and sister in law of Elizabeth Ashby (1723-1755). Elizabeth Ashby (1723-1755) was the daughter of Thomas Ashby (1700-1750) and Elizabeth LeJau. Thomas Ashby (1700-1750) was the son of the immigrant and second Cassique John Ashby (1675-1727) of Quinby Plantation, who was the son-in-law of immigrant Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) and brother-in-law of John Coming Ball (1714-1764).

In 1791, Archibald Broûn (1752-1797) conveyed Blessing Plantation to Henry Laurens, Jr. (1763-1821) (Irving 1842:52; Smith 1917a:25-26; Stoney 1932:135). According to Larry Koger (1995:110-119), John Holman Sr. (d. 1792) purchased Blessing Plantation from Archibald Brown [sic] (1752-1797) for £2500. Perhaps Laurens acted as a transactional trustee for John Holman Sr. (d. 1792). This is significant, as Koger was the first scholar to acknowledge the ownership of a Cooper River plantation by a white slave trader and his African-born wife (Koger 1995:110, 119, 254; Schweninger 1990:106). A detailed discussion of John
Holman Sr. and his European-African family appeared in chapter three. The following paragraph places him within the Blessing Plantation chain of title.

John Holman Sr. (d. 1792) died as resident of St. Thomas Parish and his estate was valued at £3,451 sterling and 3 shillings. In 1794, John Holman Jr. (1768-1823) took over management of Blessing Plantation when Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821) relinquished his executor's power of the Estate of John Holman Sr. (d. 1792). In 1798, John Holman Jr. (1768-1823) disbanded Blessing Plantation, moved to Georgetown District, then in 1805 permanently returned to the Rio Pongo as an African-born absentee planter. His story becomes very visible by the fact that all dominant historical sources erased his land tenure on the East Branch. The plantation reverted to Henry Laurens Jr.

When Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821) died, he devised Blessing Plantation to Jordan Myrick (1785-1834) and his daughter-in-law Margaret Harleston Corbett Laurens (1805-1850) (Bowen 1952:47; Smith 1917a:26). Margaret Harleston Corbett was the daughter of Thomas Corbett Jr. (1770-1850) and Elizabeth Harleston (1770-1837), who were cousins; Margaret Harleston Corbett Laurens (1805-1850) married her cousin Frederick Laurens (1802-1827).

At the age of seventeen, Jordan Myrick (1785-1834) began his career as intern under the direction of his uncle Matthew Myrick, who was the overseer at Dean Hall Plantation located across the Cooper River from Hagan Plantation. He
left there and became the overseer at Villa and Richmond Plantations (Bowen 1952:47). Myrick acquired enough wealth to mortgage his half of Blessing Plantation for $35,765 (Bowen 1952:47). Jordan Myrick (1785-1834) was one of the few overseers to move up socially to landowner and eventually to slaveholder. Cooper and Terrill (2009:224) stated that, “[a]fter twenty-five years of employment with the same planter, Myrick was able to buy a small rice estate and 33 slaves.” Upon Jordan Myrick’s (1785-1834) death, Margaret Harleston Corbett Laurens (1805-1850) purchased his half (Smith 1917a:26).

**Cedar Hill Plantation**

According to its original boundaries, Cedar Hill Plantation appeared to be the one hundred-acres tract granted in 1700 to George Juin, which Juin acquired in 1775 as formerly the property of John Combe (Smith 1917a:26). The grant included four hundred sixty-two acres of a 1704 eight hundred-acre grant to Alexander de la Motte (PG 38:459; Salley 1915:173; Smith 1917a:26).

John Deas Sr. (1735-1790) conveyed Cedar Hill Plantation, which contained two hundred sixty-seven acres, to his son, John Deas Jr. (d. 1790) (CCDB B6:414; Smith 1917a:25-26). His son died shortly thereafter in the same year (Heitzler 2012:128). His executrix conveyed six hundred twenty-eight acres to his brother-in-law Archibald Broün (1752-1797). This transaction also included a one hundred twenty-four-acre tract called ‘The Folly,’ which disappeared, however,
the name remained in the toponyms Folly Landing and Folly Road, which leads to the landing (Miles 2004:52; Smith 1917a:26). A folly could be a lush and overgrown area of bushes and trees or a whimsical construction or something in ruin (Miles 2004:52).


**Cherry Hill Plantation**

When John Deas, Sr. (1735-1790) died, his estate conveyed Cherry Hill Plantation, which contained six hundred twenty-eight acres lying on the river and French Quarter Creek, to his son-in-law Archibald Broüin (1752-1797) (CCDB G6:435; Smith 1917a:26). In 1791, Archibald Broüin (1752-1797) altered the acreage of Cherry Hill Plantations. In 1796, Archibald Broüin (1752-1797) conveyed Cherry Hill, which contained seven hundred forty-six acres, to Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821) (Smith 1917a:26). When Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821) died, he devised Cherry Hill Plantation to his daughter Harriot Horry Laurens (1813-
1888), who later married Commodore Duncan Nathaniel Ingraham (1802-1891) (Irving 1842:52; Smith 1917a:26; Stoney 1932:135).

**Group VII: Hagan, Akinfield, Moreland, Benevento, and Spring Hill**

West of Wisboo Creek (also known as French Quarter Creek) and at the point where the Cooper River divides into its two branches was Hagan Plantation. Akinfield Plantation was south of Hagan Plantation and west of Spring Hill Plantation. Moreland Plantation, located immediately south of Akinfield Plantation, included a mix of high and low lands but no rice fields; John Moore (d. 1732) was its original owner, from whom the name derived (Miles 2004:80). Moreland Plantation was known also as Brickyard Plantation because a large brickmaking facility developed there (Brockington 1996:20; Miles 2004:30). A 1760 advertisement noted, “Bricks to be Sold, in any Quantity from 6,000 to several hundred thousand, by John Moore of St. Thomas Parish” (quote in Miles 2004:80). At one time, Benevento Plantation, situated on Wisboo or French Quarter Creek was a part of Hagan Plantation; its only known location was shown as Williams Bluff on the Ferguson/Babson map (Brockington and Associates 1996:23). Although little is known about Benevento, Rev. Robert F. Clute (1884:16) noted that it was the site of a skirmish between Francis Marion’s Brigade and a corps of cavalry under the command of Tarleton. By 1754, John
Huger I acquired 4,965 acres that included Hagan Plantation’s fertile rice lands and the residence, Akinfield and Moreland Plantations.

Spring Hill/Wisboo Plantation, contained 1,024 acres, was south of Hagan Plantation and west of Moreland Plantation on both sides of French Quarter Creek. The main part of Spring Hill Plantation, which contained five hundred ten acres of the seven hundred thirty-four acres, was on the west side of the creek and two hundred ninety acres was on the east side of the creek.

**Hagan Plantation**

In 1688, Samuel Wilson received a Proprietor’s grant of one thousand acres of high land only on Ahagan Creek, variously spelled Ahagan, Hagan, and Ehegging (Miles 2004:18; PG 39:69; Smith 1917a:27). The shortened name, Hagan, applied to the plantation. In 1690, Samuel Wilson sold this tract to Thomas Gunn (d. >1708) (Smith 1917a:27). In 1708, after Gunn’s death, his nieces conveyed the tract to Henry Miller (Leiding 1921:79; Smith 1917a:27). It is possible that Henry Miller’s ancestor was French Huguenot émigré Pierre Mounier; the family anglicized their name when Moses Mounier began calling himself Moses Miller in 1728/29 (Bates and Leland 2015: 248-249). In 1720, Miller and his wife Sarah Miller conveyed the tract to Colonel William Rhett (1666-1723) (Smith 1917a:27). In 1722, William Rhett (1666-1723) was one of the richest and most important men in the proprietary period (Miles 2004:18, 98). When Colonel William Rhett
(1666-1723) died, Sarah Cooke Rhett (d. 1745) married Chief Justice Nicholas Trott (1663-1740) (Smith 1917a:27). Both Rhett and Trott were instrumental in the capture and execution of the notorious pirate Stede Bonnet.

In 1699, Humphrey Torquett received a grant for three hundred twenty acres covering all the cedar swamp between Ahagan Bluff and ‘Wisbooe’ (French Quarter) Creek and bounding on Ahagan lands (PG 39:400; Salley 1915:141, 161). In 1704, his brother Paul Torquett received a grant of four hundred fifty acres of swamp “lying at the T west of Ahagan Creek” (Salley 1915:185; Smith 1917a:28). In 1711, Paul Torquett sold four hundred fifty acres of swamp to Antoine Bonneau (1645-1700) of Bonneau Ferry Plantation, whose sons Samuel (1725-1788) and Benjamin Bonneau (b. 1721) sold in 1753 to Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) (Bates and Leland 2015:349; Smith 1917a:28).

In 1729, the daughters of Humphrey Torquett - Sarah Torquett Belin (1695-1764) and Judith Torquett Ford - conveyed seventy of their three hundred twenty-acre grant to Chief Justice Nicholas Trott (1663-1740) and Sarah Cooke Rhett Trott (1665-1745) (Smith 1917a:27). Further, the three hundred twenty acres ‘melted down to’ seventy because a map of Hagan plantation revealed, “the whole 1,070 acres includes all the river swamp” (Smith 1917a:27). Sarah Cooke Rhett Trott (1665-1745) survived her second husband and devised Hagan Plantation to her grandson, William Moore (b. 1721), son of her daughter,
Catherine Rhett Moore (1705-1745) who married Roger Moore (1694-1759) son of the former Colonial Governor James Moore (1650-1706) (Smith 1917a:27). In 1748, William Moore (b. 1721) conveyed the tract to Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) of Limerick Plantation (CCDB GG:204: Smith 1917a:27).

In 1704, Thomas Monk (Monck) (1688-1713), husband of Martha Akin Monk (b.1694), received a grant of one hundred twenty acres, which he conveyed the next year to William Poole (d. 1750) (PG 38:452; Salley 1915:188; Smith 1917a:28). In 1704 and 1710, William Poole (d. 1750) received grants of one hundred fifty acres and sixty acres, respectively (PG 38:453, 39:75; Salley 1915:224). In 1704, Richard Darney received a grant of seventy acres, which he conveyed to William Poole (d. 1750) (PG 38:489). In 1750, William Poole died and devised four hundred acres to his son William Poole Jr. who sold the entire four hundred acres to Captain Thomas Bonny (d. 1761) (Smith 1917a:28). Captain Thomas Bonny (d. 1761) devised the four hundred-acre tract to his daughters, Anne Bonny Hull (1724-<1772) and Martha Bonny. Anne Bonny (1724-<1772) married William Hull (1721-1773) (Smith 1917a:28). In August 1783, the sisters conveyed the four hundred acres to Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) (Smith 1917a:28).

Perhaps only Martha Bonny made the conveyance because her sister Anne Bonny Hull died before 1772. Anne’s death cannot be any later because William Hull of ‘Euhany’ married his second wife Sarah Field in August 1772 (Hayne
Their sister Hannah Bonny (1720-1754) married William Waties III (1721-1773) of Yourhaney (Yauhannah Bluff) Plantation. In 1694, the William Waties family arrived from Wales and settled near Charles Town. His son and grandson accumulated large tracts along the Waccamaw, Pee Dee, and Little Rivers in Horry County as well as in the Georgetown area (Burroughs 2005). In 1754, following Hannah’s (1720-1754) death, Martha Bonny sold her devised interest in Yauhannah Plantation to her brother-in-law William Waties III (1721-1773).

Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) possessed 1,920 acres, which he devised to his son John Huger I (1744-1804) (Bates and Leland 2015:184; Smith 1917a:28). In 1786, John Huger I (1744-1804) added two grants that totaled 1,008 acres of marshland on the Cooper River (Smith 1917a:29). When John Huger I (1744-1804) died, he devised Hagan, Akinfield, and Moreland Plantations among his heirs. John Huger I (1744-1804) devised Hagan Plantation to his eldest son, Daniel Elliott Huger (1749-1858). In 1819 in a legal settlement of John Huger’s I (1744-1804) estate, Hagan Plantation, which contained 1,418 acres, transferred to his son, John Huger II (1786-1853). John Huger I (1738-1804) married twice. His first wife, Ann Broün (1753-1835), was the mother of Alfred Huger (1788-1872), Daniel Elliott Huger (1749-1858), and Dr. Benjamin Huger (1793-1874). Ann Broün (1753-1835) was the daughter of immigrant Dr. Robert Broün (1714-1759).
and sister of Archibald Broün (1752-1797), the husband of Mary Deas Broün (1762-1857). Charlotte Motte (1745-1785) was the second wife of John Huger I and mother of Daniel Huger (1779-1852). Hagan Plantation remained in the Huger family until 1857.

**Blanchard/Benevento Plantation**

In a family arrangement before 1819, Daniel Elliot Huger (1749-1858) conveyed four hundred forty-two acres from Hagan Plantation called Blanchard’s to his younger brother Dr. Benjamin Huger (1793-1874) (Smith 1917a:30). Dr. Benjamin Huger (1793-1874) renamed the tract Benevento Plantation.

**Akinfield/Woodland Plantation**

In 1694, immigrant Jonathan Amory (1653-1699), who became a merchant in Charles Town, received a grant of two hundred acres, which in 1695, he conveyed to immigrant Thomas Akin I (1660-1705) (Bates and Leland 2015:181; Smith 1917a:28). Thomas Akin I (1660-1705) received three proprietary grants: (1) in 1695, two hundred acres, (2) in 1697, one hundred fifty acres, and (3) in 1703, two hundred acres (PG 38:338; Salley 1915:147; Smith 1917a:28). In 1697, Hugh Fling received two small grants of seventy acres and fifty acres.

When Thomas Akin I (1660-1705) died, these tracts devised to his sons John (b. 1688), Thomas II (b. 1698), and James I (b. 1700) (Smith 1917a:28). Thomas
Akin I (1660-1705) also left a wife, Elizabeth (1666), and four daughters: Sarah Akin Lloyd (1690-1746), Mary Akin Russell (1692-1763), Martha Akin Monck McGregor (1694-1747), and Elizabeth Akin (Smith 1917a:28). In 1715, an Act enabled Elizabeth Akin (b. 1666) to acquire the Fling tracts, which contained seventy acres and fifty acres (Smith 1917a:28), as witnessed by a legislative act:

An ACT to vest the estate in two tracts of land in this Province, sold by Hugh Fling, late of this Province, deceased, to Elizabeth Akin, widow, but no conveyance thereof by him executed before his death ... (McCord 1839)

In 1717, John Akin (b. 1688) acquired fifty-five acres of cedar swamp (Smith 1917a:28-29). Upon his death, he devised this tract and his interest in his father’s estate as a life estate to his mother and then to his brothers and sisters (Smith 1917a:28-29). In 1729 this tract, as well as the others that totaled eight hundred forty-five acres, vested in James Akin I (1700-1758) who married Sarah Bremar (1725-1750) (CCDB K5:433; Smith 1917a:29). All holdings vested in their eldest son, James Akin II (1743-1783) who also increased the property to 1,271 acres (Smith 1917a:29). In 1784, the Estate of James Akin II (1743-1783) conveyed Akinfield Plantation to John Huger I (1744-1804) (CCDB X6:381; NRHP 2002:6; Smith 1917a:29).

Last Will, Akinfield Plantation, which contained 1,723 acres, devised to his son, John Huger II (1786-1853). John Huger II (1786-1853) changed the name to Woodland Plantation. In 1804, John Huger II (1786-1853) conveyed Woodland Plantation, including high and low lands and rice fields, to John Harleston (1797-1831) (Smith 1917a:30).

**Moreland/Brickyard Plantation**

In 1701, Thomas Lynch (1675-1738) received a grant of five hundred acres. In 1711, Thomas Lynch (1675-1738) sold this tract to Jeremiah Russell (1681-1748) husband of Mary Akin Russell (1692-1763) (Smith 1917a:29). This tract included two hundred seventy-five acres granted to John Stone (1699-1725) and other adjacent tracts (Smith 1917a:29). In 1796, the estate of Thomas Withers conveyed one hundred fifteen acres to John Huger I (1744-1804) (CCDB X6:381; Smith 1917a:29). This tract was part of a three hundred ninety-acre grant to John Stone (1699-1725) (Smith 1917a:29). In 1798, John Huger I (1744-1804) acquired a large tract lying south of Akin or Akinfield Plantation, which included five hundred acres that Thomas Lynch (1675-1738) previously conveyed to Jeremiah Russell (1681-1748) (Smith 1917a:29).

Under the Last Will of Mary Russell Deveaux (b. 1737), the granddaughter of Thomas Akin (1660-1705), the seven hundred seventy-five acres devised to her children, John Deveaux (b. 1762), Andrew Deveaux (b. 1760) and their sister,
Mary Deveaux Roddam (b. 1758). The children transferred the seven hundred seventy-five-acre tract to John Huger I (1744-1804) (CCDB X6:301; Smith 1917a:29). When John Huger I (1744-1804) died, he devised Moreland Plantation to his son, Alfred Huger (1788-1872) (Smith 1917a:30). Moreland Plantation contained 1,386 acres, which included the tract Alfred Huger (1788-1872) purchased from Roddam and Deveaux (Smith 1917a:30).

In 1819, Alfred Huger (1788-1872) sold Moreland Plantation to Colonel John Gordon (1787-1835), master builder and bricklayer (CCDB V9:262; Smith 1917a:30). In 1828, Gordon (1787-1835) added 1,317 acres called Pagett’s Landing, formerly a part of Brabant Plantation with an established brickyard and “thereby realized a great fortune” (Miles 2004:30; Smith 1917a:30). Gordon (1787-1835) made bricks at three Cooper River plantations: Brickyard, Moreland, and Grove on Beresford Creek (Wayne 1992:58-59).

Spring Hill Plantation

In 1694, Denis Hayes received a warrant for one hundred acres (Smith 1917a:31). In 1710 and 1712, Charles Hayes (1694-1732) received eighty acres and one hundred acres, respectively (PG 39:76, 235; Salley 1915:224; Smith 1917a:31). Charles Hayes (1694-1732) inherited the Denis Hayes tract (Smith 1917a:31).

In 1704, Humphrey Torquett’s daughters received two hundred thirty acres (PG 38:449; Smith 1917a:31). The daughters were: Marianne Torquett Ford
or Foord (d. 1755) who married Joseph Ford/Foord; Deborah Sarah (Sarah Turkitt) Belin (1695-1764) who married James Lynch Belin II (1695-1745) grandson of immigrant Jonack ‘Jonah’ Lynch (1656-1691); Judith Torquett Ford/Foord who married Ebenezer Ford/Foord; and Elizabeth Torquett who died young. In 1717, James Lynch Belin II (1695-1745) and Sarah Torquett Belin (1695-1764) conveyed her interest to Joseph Ford/Foord (Smith 1917a:31). Joseph Ford/Foord devised his interest to Ebenezer Ford/Foord (Smith 1917a:31). In 1723, Ebenezer Ford/Foord and his wife Judith Torquett Ford/Foord, conveyed two hundred thirty acres to Charles Hayes (1694-1732) (Smith 1917a:31).

When Charles Hayes I (1694-1732) died, he devised the tract to his eldest son Charles Hayes II (1710-1735) (Smith 1917a:31). In 1732, Charles Hayes II (1710-1735) conveyed two hundred fifty-five acres to his brother George Hayes (b. 1718) (CCDB K:384; Smith 1917a:31). George Hayes (b. 1718) sold the tract with a dwelling house to French Huguenot émigré Jean Bonnoitt (d. 1749), storekeeper and planter (Bates and Leland 2015:48; Smith 1917a:31). Jean Bonnoitt (d. 1749) conveyed two hundred fifty-five acres to Dr. Walter Dallas (d. 1749) (CCDB EE:265; Smith 1917a:31). When Dr. Walter Dallas (d. 1749) died, he devised the tract to Francis Dallas (d. 1759) (Smith 1917a:31). In 1759, Robert Quash (1700-1772), as executor of the estate of Francis Dallas (d. 1759), sold the property to George Seaman (d. 1769) (CCDB B4:237; Smith 1917a:31).
In 1753, Elizabeth Goodbie Hayes (b. 1714), the widow of Charles Hayes (d. 1735), and his son John Hayes (b. 1731) conveyed two hundred fifty-five acres to Robert Quash (1700-1772) (CCDB B4:211; Smith 1917a:31). Robert Quash (1700-1772) with his wife Elizabeth DuBois Quash (b. 1725-1774) transferred the tract to George Seaman (d. 1769) (CCDB A4:387; Smith 1917a:31). George Seaman (d. 1769) united the original five hundred ten acres on the west side of French Quarter Creek.

In 1762, George Seaman (d. 1769) conveyed the five hundred ten-acre tract to Thomas Dearington (d. 1794) (Bacot 1922:38; CCDB A4:381, B4:218; Smith 1917a:31). Sometime in 1762, Thomas Dearington (d. 1794) installed a large straight canal that replaced the meandering creek from where the creek entered Spring Hill Plantation adjacent to Hagan Plantation to a point east of the bridge on the public road to Charles Town (Bacot 1922:38; Irving 1842:49; Smith 1917a:31).

In 1697, French Huguenot émigré Pierre Dutartre (d. 1724) received a grant for two hundred forty acres on the east side of French Quarter Creek (PG 38:333; Smith 1917a:31). In 1724, the Dutartre family was involved in a religious or fanatical episode that resulted in the murder of Captain Peter Simons (1693-1724), the first son of Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717) and Marie Esther DuPré Simons (1674-1737) and led to the execution of four people (Bates and Leland

Contrary to the above account, Huguenot Society president Thomas W. Bacot (1922:26-40) provided a more accurate accounting of Spring Hill Plantation and the ownership of the Dutartre tract. Bacot (1922:26, 37) concurred that, in 1697, Pierre Dutartre (d. 1724) received a proprietary grant but that it was for two hundred thirty acres rather than two hundred forty acres; the difference in surveying methods accounted for the difference in recorded acreage.

In 1774, Dr. Mayer conveyed three tracts to John Huger, in trust for his brothers William, Thomas, and Joseph Mayer (Bacot 1922:29). The three tracts were fifty acres, one hundred ninety-one acres, and one acre. The Church of St. Denis was on the one-acre tract near the public road next to Brabant Plantation;
“no sign or vestige of [the Church of St. Denis] now appears” (Smith 1917a:32). In 1784, the three tracts were resurveyed and divided into three equal tracts of eighty-seven and one-half acres, which Joseph Mayer conveyed to the brothers (Bacot 1922:30). In 1784, Mayer conveyed tract No. 2 to Richard Dearington (d. 1789) (Bacot 1917:52). In 1785, Thomas Mayer [Mayers] conveyed tract No. 3, which contained eighty-five acres to Richard Dearington (d. 1789) (Bacot 1917:53). In 1787, William Mayer conveyed tract No. 1 with the buildings, which contained eighty-one acres to Thomas Mayer and John George Brindley, “reserving to Thomas Mayer and family the right of Burial place on said Tract”; this tract contained the French Church (Bacot 1917:52-53). Accounts were silent regarding how full interest in tract No. 1 conveyed to Thomas Dearington; although in 1792, John George Brindley and three others conveyed four of six shares to Thomas Dearington (Bacot 1917:53; 1922:30).

When Richard Dearington (d. 1789) died, his Last Will directed the sale of all personal property at public auction and the sale of all real estate by private contract (Bacot 1917:53; Will Book B/1786-1793:243). Proceeds from the sale were equally divided among his brothers Robert (d. 1793), Thomas (d. 1794), and John Dearington as his heirs; Robert (d. 1793) and Thomas (d. 1794) Dearington served as executors (Bacot 1922:30; Will Book B 1786-1793:243). In 1792, Thomas Dearington (d. 1794) owned all three tracts. When Thomas Dearington (d. 1794)
died, Spring Hill Plantation passed to his son, Robert Dearington (Irving 1842:48; Smith 1917a:33; Stoney 1932:128; Will Book C:134). However, in actuality, Thomas Dearington (d. 1794) devised Spring Hill Plantation to Robert Dearington’s (d. 1793) son and wife (Bacot 1922:35-36).

When Robert Dearington (d. 1793) died in Sumter, South Carolina, he devised Spring Hill Plantation to his wife, Ann Rees Dearington, and his son, Colonel John Darrington (1786-1855), one of the wealthiest men in Alabama. In 1824, Ann Rees Dearington conveyed her share to Colonel John Darrington (1786-1855) (Bacot 1922:36). In 1824, Colonel John Darrington (1786-1855) conveyed Spring Hill Plantation to Colonel Jacob Bond l’On (1782-1859) (Bacot 1922:36).

**Group VIII: Nicholson, Jericho, Irishtown**

This group includes several adjacent inland plantations with connections to those fronting on the East Branch. Very little research has been conducted on this part of St. James Santee Parish (c.f. Bates and Leland 2015); therefore, it was difficult to extrapolate chains of title for these plantations. Two hundred acres of Cypress Barony that belonged to Dominick Arthur (d. 1714) became Nicholson Plantation. Jericho Plantation was located three miles upstream from Windsor Plantation on the headwaters of the East Branch. The Ball family owned Jericho (Gann) Plantation during the Revolutionary War; Tory Elias Wambaw Ball (1744-
1822), while living in England made note of it in a 1786 letter to his cousin, Elias Ball III (1752-1810) at Kensington Plantation (Deas 1909:103). Isaac Ball (1785-1825) amassed 5,805 acres, which contained Jericho, Nicholson, and Farewell Corner Plantations (Smith 2012). Adjoining Cypress Barony, northeast of Silk Hope Plantation, was a tract or plantation of 6,488 acres, known as Irishtown. Irishtown Plantation was five miles southeast of Windsor Plantation on Turkey Creek, bounded Hell Hole Swamp, and abutted Northhampton Plantation (Leland 1972; Poplin and Philips 2011; Smith 2012:223). Irishtown was one of the oldest documented names for a community found in Berkeley County (Community and Neighborhood Names 1964). Major Isaac Harleston aggregated either a grant or number of grants into one plantation (Smith 1931:159-160). Further, it was speculated that the name may have come from Irishmen, John Gough, Michael Mahon, and Dominick Arthur, who bought the adjoining tract of Cypress Barony. Alternatively, it was possible that Major Isaac Harleston named it Irishtown Plantation for his ancestors who fled to Ireland when Cromwell took over England. In 1748, Irishtown Plantation was the setting of an alleged enslaved laborer plot to mount a rebellion (q.v. chapter three).

**Nicholson Plantation (St. James Santee Parish)**

In 1724, Christopher Arthur conveyed two hundred acres to John Nicholson (d. 1754) (CCDB D:64; Hawley 1946:4; Smith 1911a:10). John Nickleson

**Jericho Plantation (St. James Santee Parish)**

In 1718/19, Francis Harris owned Jericho Plantation (Smith 2012:208). Before becoming the property of the Ball’s, the plantation passed through James Nicholas Mayrant (d. 1727/28) and his wife, Susanne Gaillard Mayrant (d. 1736)
who lived in St. James, Santee. Then sometime before 1754, perhaps as early as 1724, the Mayrants conveyed it to Daniel Huger II (1687-1754) (Bates and Leland 2015:241; Smith 2012:208). Benjamin Huger (1746-1779) inherited Jericho Plantation and conveyed it to John Ball (1760-1817) (Cable et al. 1991:86; Smith 2012:208).

John Ball (1760-1817) and his cousin and brother-in-law, John Coming Ball II (1758-1792), purchased several tracts in the mid- and late-eighteenth century to assemble the 3,527-acre Jericho Plantation. John Coming Ball II (1758-1792) was the son of John Coming Ball (1714-1764) and his second wife Judith Boisseau Ball (1725-1772). Family members referred to John Coming Ball II (1758-1792) as ‘Poor John Coming,’ John Langstaff, or Cousin Staff (Deas 1909:96-98). When John Coming Ball (1714-1764) died, his son John Coming Ball II (1758-1792) was six-years-old and when his mother died, he was fourteen-years-old. He grew up alongside his cousin John Ball (1760-1817) of Kensington Plantation who was only two years younger than he. John Coming Ball II (1758-1792) never married. After disposing of his property in South Carolina and in ill health, John Coming Ball II (1758-1792) moved to Rockaway, New York where he died at the home of Abigail Cornell (Redding 1998:6). He left his property, including Jericho Plantation in St. James, Santee Parish and Back River Plantation in St. James, Goose Creek Parish to the children of his sisters, Jane Ball (1761-1804) and
Eleanor Ball Wilson (1765-1827), with his brother-in-law and cousin John Ball (1760-1817) as the executor. Following the death of John Coming Ball II (1758-1792), his executors rented Jericho Plantation to John Jaudon between 1797 and 1803, at £15 annually (Smith 2012:209).

John Ball (1760-1817) may have inherited Jericho Plantation from his father, Elias Ball II (1709-1786). However, in 1810, John Coming Ball’s II (1758-1792) estate was divided between John Ball Jr. (1782-1834) and Isaac Ball (1785-1825). In 1810, Isaac Ball (1785-1825) inherited Jericho Plantation; Isaac Ball created a 5,805-acre complex, which included Jericho, Nicholson, and Farewell Corner Plantations (Smith 2012:209). After Isaac Ball (1785-1825) died, Jericho Plantation devised to his brother, John Ball Jr. (1782-1834) who held it until his death (Ball 1929:314).

**Irishtown Plantation (St. James Santee Parish)**

It was difficult to ascertain the original grants composing this tract, however, a plat located in the South Carolina Historical Society archives contained the derivations of several tracts. The plat, dated 1700, indicated that Irishtown contained 1,548 acres and belonged to Andrew Hasell, who received the plantation as five separate tracts. The plantation was bounded by Elias Ball of Limerick, Major Edwards of Windsor, Robert Quash of Fishbrook, Isaac
Harleston, land of the heirs of unnamed person, and land owned by an unnamed person.

Tract A, containing five hundred fifty-five acres, was originally three separate tracts. The first tract contained 173.5 acres of the original six hundred acres granted to William Wright in 1729. Wright sold this tract to Edward Howard who sold it to Thomas Hasell as two hundred acres. The second tract, containing 204.5 acres, was originally granted to Daniel Honly (possibly Horry?). John Nicholson sold the tract to Thomas Hasell as two hundred three acres. The third tract, contained one hundred seventy-seven acres, which were a part of Arthur’s Barony sold by Christopher Arthur to John Nicholson as two hundred acres.

Tract B, containing three hundred acres, was originally granted to William Wright as stated in Tract A. This tract was sold by Robert Sallens to Andrew Hasell as three hundred acres of which twenty-four acres were rice lands. Tract C, containing three hundred three acres, was originally granted to Michael Boss as five hundred acres. This tract was sold by Robert Sallens to Andrew Hasell as three hundred fifty acres. Tract D, containing one hundred acres, was part of the grant to William Wright as six hundred acres listed in Tract A. At the time of the plat, it belonged to Joseph Law. Tract E, containing two hundred fifty acres, was
part of the original five hundred-acre grant to Michael Boss as listed in Tract C. At the time of the plat, this tract belonged to the heirs of Peter Sallens.

Captain John Harleston owned Irishtown (Smith 2012:223). During the Revolutionary War, Major Isaac Child Harleston (1746-1798), brother of William Harleston (1757-1816), owned Irishtown Plantation (Smith 1917a:14; Stoney 1932:182). William Harleston (1757-1816), of Hut Plantation, managed the plantation’s accountings for his elder brother, Major Isaac Child Harleston (1745-1798). For example, in a 1780 letter to Isaac, William described various accountings, including a transaction with the mulatto Edward Tanner of Limerick Plantation: “I have in my hands with some money Ed^w^d^ T^a^n^n^er^ delivered and the above near £6000 ...” (Jervey 1902:161). When Major Isaac Child Harleston (1746-1798) died unmarried, he devised Irishtown Plantation to his brothers and sisters: Elizabeth Harleston (1747-1830), Margaret Harleston (1749-1820), Edward Harleston (1761-1825), and William Harleston (1757-1816) (Orvin 1973:137).

The Impact of Kinship Networks

The transfer of property (real and personal) revealed the extent of how deeply ingrained the Lowcountry planter-elite culture, based on intermarriage, manifested in the East Branch neighborhood. This section focuses on how kinship and marriage informed this distinctive close-knit riverfront
neighborhood. As discussed in chapter three, Lowcountry planter-elites, from the beginning, envisioned themselves primarily as Englishmen intent upon maintaining English cultural practices. In particular, planter-elites attached high prestige to those who accumulated and inherited estates for generations from the ‘first’ families. In fact, this pattern was common in most British colonies. For example, in Virginia, the landed gentry used their kinship to acquire large tracts of land and to dominate the tobacco industry (Glover 2000:100, 145). However, in the Carolina Lowcountry, deeply intertwined kin networks made it possible for planter-elites to ruthlessly control land, politics, and trade. It would be interesting to assess the effects of kinship upon politics and trade in a future study of the neighborhood.

In England, wealth came from land and the landed gentry not only owned land but they also received an income entirely from ‘rents’ (c.f. Peter Cross 2003). In other words, the gentry did not work for a living. In addition, high prestigious status attached to those who inherited estates over several generations. These ideals were not lost on the ‘first’ families who immigrated to enhance their family name and wealth. In the Carolina Lowcountry, land ownership led to wealth. The East Branch community serves as a case study for briefly examining the creation of wealth and land through family connections.
In a basic sense, plantations operated as family businesses (Glover 2000:15). For a family operation to succeed, all members cooperated, wherein the family goals superseded the individual’s desires. During the frontier phase, high mortality and low life-expectancy rates increased the importance of kin and mutual cooperation. In other British colonies, as society stabilized, families expanded their networks to include non-related families and others. This process did not occur in the East Branch neighborhood. To the contrary, because cooperation and egalitarianism within generations promoted family interest over individualism, planter-elite families developed and fostered a strong collective identity. East Branch families relied on kin far beyond the frontier settlement period and marriage became the vehicle to land and wealth.

Family was of importance from the outset. The immigration of siblings formed the basis of horizontal family connections during early settlement. For example, the Ball and Harleston dynasties began with the arrival of Affra Harleston (c. 1651-1698) and her brother John Harleston (c. 1660-1738). The Horry dynasty began with the arrival of French Huguenot brothers Elias (1664-1736), Daniel (1668-1695), and Peter (1666-1739).

To protect and create family estates, these settlers deepened their reliance on kin through advantageous marriages. The planter-elite interpreted incest extremely narrowly. The practice of first cousin and exchange marriage (between
sets of siblings from two different families) were frequent. For example, John Ball (1760-1817) married his cousin Jane Ball (1761-1804). Elizabeth Bryan (1784-1812) married her cousin John Ball Jr. (1782-1834). Thomas Corbett Jr. (1770-1850) married his cousin Elizabeth Harleston (1770-1837). Benjamin Simons I (1672-1757), of Middleburg Plantation, married the daughter of his benefactors and his cousin Marie Esther DuPré (d. 1737).

Additionally, marriages within acceptable social circle unions included those between affinal kin (related by marriage). For example, Robert Quash Jr. (1740-1811) married Constantia Hasell (d. 1775) and then her sister Sarah Hasell (1773-1821). Sisters Judith Torquett and Marianne Torquett (d. 1755) married brothers Ebenezer Ford and Joseph Ford, respectively. Affinal marriages crossed generational lines. Thomas Corbett (1743-1814) married Margaret Harleston (1749-1820); their son Thomas Corbett Jr. (1770-1850) married his cousin Elizabeth Harleston (1770-1837).

Fathers (and mothers) were expected to remarry and start second (sometimes, third) families. One could imagine that step and half siblings strained family relations, however, quite the contrary happened. Bonds strengthened as older siblings in blended families, separated by as much as twenty years, served as surrogate parents rather than siblings. For example, Elias ‘Red Cap’ Ball (1676-1751) married twice; his second wife was not much older
than his oldest daughter. His daughter Elizabeth ‘Betty’ Ball (1711-1746) married three times. Nicholas Harleston II (1710-1768) married Sarah Child (1715-1756), his sister in law and the wife of his brother John Harleston (1708-1767), Hannah Child (1719-1763). When Sarah Child Harleston died, Nicholas Harleston married Ann Ashby (b. 1728). Partible inheritance, which apportioned property among all heirs, leveled the ‘playing field’ for all children. In the case of intestacy, until 1791, South Carolina law favored primogeniture, which passed all the wealth to the eldest son (see Alston and Schapiro 1984 for an analysis of inheritance laws in the colonies).

Perhaps most valuable was the practice of naming children after living relatives. Names reinforced the desire to secure the child in the broader family network. Not only did one’s name connect one to his/her immediate family but a name revealed connections to the wider family network. The importance of this statement cannot be overlooked. For example, Harleston Rutledge Bryan (1836-1921) was the second person to hold this name; in 1834, the first to hold this name died as an infant. The Ball family reused the name Elias so often that John Ball (1760-1817) and Martha Caroline Swinton Taveau Ball (1785-1847) named one of their sons, Elias Octavus Ball (1809-1893) who continued the tradition by naming one of his sons, Elias Nonus Ball (1834-1872).
Family identity intimately connected these families not only by marriage but by living in close proximity to each other, often within walking distance. East Branch families developed elaborate daily visiting rituals, collaborated on planting, bought enslaved laborers and property together, and provided a joint financial ‘safety net’. In other words, they depended upon their relatives to aid them in the operation of plantations as well as to oversee their interests.

The strong collective East Branch identity advanced a socially inclusive, highly self-conscious, closed society. Outsiders faced an uphill battle in their quest either to move up the social ladder or to move into the community. These families closed ranks to exclude those outside their familial world. John Holman Sr. (d. 1792), his family, and enslaved laborers experienced the exclusion when he purchased Blessing Plantation (q.v. chapter three and the Blessing Plantation in this chapter). Although Holman had strong business connections with Henry Laurens (1724-1792), he lacked the necessary close familial connections with the larger community. Holman, his African wife, European-African children, and imported enslaved laborers were outsiders. They lacked the necessary pedigree, and more importantly, they lacked important friendships and familial ties in the Lowcountry.
The Case of Timothy Ford

Timothy Ford’s diary entry alluded to the importance of kinship connections in the Lowcountry: “The inhabitants are almost all connected by some family relation; which make them sociable & friendly. A stranger taken notice of by one gains an early access to all” (Barnwell 1912:145-146). The social, business, and political connections developed by Timothy Ford, an attorney and politician, serve as a telling example of the intricately balanced Lowcountry elite kinship network.

Circumstance and war brought Timothy Ford (1762-1830) and Henry William De Saussure (1763-1839) into the same social sphere. Both Ford and De Saussure served in the Revolutionary War. The De Saussure family were staunch Tories and, therefore, they were banished from Charles Town. During the siege of Charles Town, young Henry William De Saussure was a prisoner aboard the Pack-Horse, a prison ship in Charles Town Harbor. In 1781 as part of a prisoner exchange, he joined his family in Philadelphia. Following the War, Ford and De Saussure traveled similar career paths. Ford attended ‘Nassau Hall’ (later Princeton College) for law, graduated with honors and studied law with Robert Morris in Philadelphia (Barnwell 1912:132-133). De Saussure attended Princeton College and studied law under Jared Ingersoll in Philadelphia. In Philadelphia, De Saussure met, and later married, Elizabeth Ford; in 1785, De Saussure, his
wife, and Timothy Ford relocated to Charles Town, where they established the law office of DeSaussure and Ford, which trained several prominent attorneys, including John C. Calhoun.

Timothy Ford (1762-1830) was son of Colonel Jacob Ford (1738-1777) and Theodosia Johnes Ford (1741-1824), daughter of the local Presbyterian minister, of Morristown, New Jersey. Colonel Jacob Ford was a land, mill, and mine owner who, before the Revolutionary War, built his wife the largest private home in Morristown, New Jersey. Between 1779 and 1780, Theodosia Johnes Ford (1741-1824) opened her home to General Nathanael Greene as a winter headquarters for General Washington.

Timothy Ford (1762-1830) married first Sarah ‘Miss Sally’ Amelia De Saussure, sister of the Henry ‘Billy’ William De Saussure (1763-1839) and married second wife Mary Magdalen Prioleau, daughter of Samuel Prioleau (1690-1752) and Mary Marie Magdalen Gendron (c. 1691-1765). His sister, Elizabeth ‘Betsy’ Ford (d. 1822), married Henry William De Saussure (1763-1839), a second-generation French Huguenot and one of the most distinguished judges in South Carolina. Initially, the immigrant De Saussure family settled in Beaufort before relocating to Charles Town (Hirsch 1999:223). Charlotte Matilda Ford (1796-1826), the only child and daughter of Timothy Ford (1762-1830) and his first wife, Sarah Amelia De Saussure, was the first wife of Dr. Edmund Ravenel (1797-
1871), professor and dean of South Carolina Medical College, who then married her half-sister, Louisa Cordes Ford, daughter of Timothy Ford (1762-1830) and his second wife Mary Magdalen Prioleau. To complicate this further, Dr. Edmund Ravenel’s parents were Daniel Ravenel (1762-1807) and Catherine Cordes Prioleau (1769-1849). Both the Ravenel and Prioleau families were ‘old’ French Huguenot families in St. John’s Berkeley Parish.

Catherine Cordes Prioleau’s (1769-1849) parents were Samuel Prioleau (1742-1813) and Catherine Cordes (1745-1832). Catherine Cordes was the daughter of John Cordes (1718-1756) and Catherine Gendron Cordes (1724-1805). Catherine Gendron Cordes was the daughter of Thomas Cordes (1697-?) and Henrietta Catherine Gendron (d. 1764). John Cordes (1718-1756) was the son of Isaac Cordes (1692-1712) and Ellinor Coker. Bates and Leland (2015:184) identified Ellinor’s surname as Cocas. Thomas and John were brothers and sons of French Huguenot émigrés Antione Cordes (1666-1712), a French chirurgien, and his wife Esther Madelaine Balluet.

Their sister Magdalen Cordes (1693-1745) married first Harris and second Peter Simons (1693-1724). Peter’s parents were Benjamin Simons I (1672-1717) and Marie Esther DuPré of Middleburg Plantation. In 1724, Dutartre killed Peter Simons (1693-1724) (q.v. Spring Hill Plantation). Peter and Magdalen Cordes Simon’s daughter Esther Simons (1719-1760) married Peter Bonneau (c. 1698-
1748) and Benjamin Marion (1715-1778). Peter Bonneau (c. 1698-1748) was the son of Captain Antoine Bonneau (1680-1743) and Jeanne Elizabeth Videau Bonneau (1685-1744) of Bonneau Ferry Plantation. Benjamin Marion (1715-1778) of Belle Isle Plantation in St. Stephens Parish was the brother of Francis ‘Swamp Fox’ Marion (1732-1795). The Simons, owners of Middleburg Plantation, and the DuPré families lived in St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish. The Bonneau family owned Bonneau Ferry Plantation in St. John’s Berkeley Parish.

Sarah Amelia De Saussure (1770-?) was the daughter of Jean Daniel Hector de Saussure (1736-1798) and Mary McPherson (1739-1815). Jean Daniel Hector de Saussure was the son of Henri de Saussure (1709-1761) and his second wife Madelaine Brabant (c. 1710-1761) who was the daughter of Daniel Brabant Jr. (1672-1697) and Madeline de Bourdeaux Brabant (c. 1678-1710), daughter of French Huguenot émigrés Jacques de Bourdeaux and Madeleine Garillond de Bourdeaux. Madelaine Brabant de Saussure’s sister Jeanne Brabant DuPré (c. 1690-1748) married Cornelius DuPré (1680-1747), son of Josias DuPré Sr. and Martha Brabant DuPré (c. 1648-?), who was the daughter of Cornelius Brabant (c. 1610) and N.N. Brabant (c. 1565-1615). The Brabant family owned Brabant Plantation in the Orange Quarter in St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish.

By marrying into the De Saussure family, Timothy Ford became a member of an exclusive elite class that wielded economic and political power in the
Lowcountry. De Saussure’s kinship network would have exposed Ford to the ‘right’ people; for example, upon arrival at the law circuit in Beaufort, he met John Ewing Calhoun (Barnwell 1912:145). If he found himself in need of assistance, he had members of several powerful families - de Saussure, Gendron, Ravenel, Prioleau, Cordes, Simons, DuPré, Bonneau, Brabant, and de Bourdeaux - to approach for assistance. As an aside, Chancellor de Saussure wrote highly critical opinions during the Denmark Vesey trials of the accuser’s abridgment of rights; he suspected there was less to the charges of conspiracy than alleged.

**East Branch Ownership: 1780 to 1820**

Between the 1780s and the 1820s, the East Branch contained thirty separate plantations. Of the thirty plantations, four plantations (thirteen percent) did not exist before 1780. Despite the large number of plantations, a select few families owned and managed these plantations. Family names included Akin, Ball, Barnett, Bonneau, Broûn, Brown, Bryan, Colhoun, Corbett, Deas, Dearington, Edwards, Gordon, Harleston, Hamilton, Heyward, Holman, Horry, Hort, Huger, I’On, Laurens, Lucas, Manigault, Maybank, Mayer, Myrick, Pinckney, Poyas, Quash, Roche, Rutledge, Shubrick, Simons, Smith, and Thomas.

At first glance, the East Branch appeared to be very diverse. After all, only thirty-six different family names were associated with thirty plantations over a forty-
year period. However, a closer examination revealed a close-knit kin-based community with extremely few outsiders.

During the forty-year period examined, there were one hundred six transactions on thirty plantations. Of these transactions, eight (7.5%) involved different individuals in multiple transactions on twenty (66%) plantations. Single transactions occurred on one-third of the plantations. The number of owners ranged from one to twelve per plantation, with an average of 3.53 owners per plantation. A breakdown of the types of transactions is shown in the tables at the end of this chapter.

Overwhelmingly, ninety-one out of one hundred six (86%) land transactions occurred between immediate and extended family members. Few transactions involved owners who had no kinship connections to East Branch families. Joseph Brown of Georgetown married into Lowndes family and owned Winsor Plantation for two years. Major Evan Edwards (1752-1798) and his wife, Catherine Jones Edwards (b. 1785), of Pennsylvania and subsequent owners of Winsor Plantation, had no familial connections in the East Branch or Lowcountry. A close social friendship must have developed between the Brown and Edwards families because the middle name of Edwards’ daughter was Lowndes. As mentioned previously, the European-African Holman family, who
owned Blessing Plantation for six years, had no familial connections in the East Branch or the Lowcountry.

Prominent East Branch families intermarried with families from St. James Santee Parish, St. John Berkley Parish on the west branch of Cooper River, and inland plantations in St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish. Owners of inland plantations in St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish were less interrelated with the East Branch families. For example, Spring Hill Plantation owners were interrelated with non-East Branch families of St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish or families outside of the Lowcountry. Additionally, East Branch St. Thomas and St. Denis families intermarried more often with St. James Goose Creek families. St John’s Berkeley Parish East Branch families intermarried more often among themselves or with families in Each Branch St. Thomas and St. Denis Parish.

Conclusion

As I demonstrated in this chapter, the planter-elites developed strategies for a tight-knit, kin-based community that relied upon intermarriage within the larger neighborhood. Strategies such as advantageous marriages, partible inheritance, sibling-based horizontal connections, and mutual cooperation created a homogenous, exclusive, interdependent ‘closed’ society intent on distancing themselves from the outside and protecting themselves from rivals.
Family identity intimately connected these families in a family-based neighborhood within walking distance of each other. As demonstrated, the East Branch community became isolated as family members married each other, raised each other’s children, developed daily visiting rituals, and collaborated on planting, buying enslaved laborers, and property. These habits developed into lifelong patterns of interdependence.

Understanding the social history of the area has the potential to broaden our understanding of land settlement, land modification, and to explain how the planter-elite and the enslaved black majority viewed the landscape. Isolation among the elite translated into isolation among the enslaved population. Since their owners rarely left the local area, their enslaved laborers rarely left the area as well. Their social history provides clues to understanding how planter-informed ideology manifested in landscape features and how the enslaved laborer reacted to that ideology.

The relationship and distribution of families informed the use of the landscape. Historical archaeologists investigate plantations at various scales. At the smallest scale, such as activity areas, the purpose is to determine where one person or a few people carried out a single activity. However, identification of an activity area assumes knowledge of specific depositional sites. At a larger scale, such as work areas or households, patterns may emerge within particular
‘boundaries’ that indicate clusters of activity. At the scale of settlement patterns, archaeologists are interested in where and how sites, defined by the clustering of structural remains, are spatially related and how people at these sites interacted with the environment.

By diachronically exploring multiple plantations, archaeologists gain insight into the deeply ingrained interconnectedness that permeated plantation neighborhoods similar to the East Branch. ‘Space,’ defined as a continuous area, and ‘boundaries,’ defined as lines demarking the limits of an area, become questionable units of measurement. At the regional scale, the very meaning of ‘space’ and ‘boundaries’ changes. Taken together, the implication of this chapter suggests that plantation-era settlement studies should move beyond the scale of a single plantation. I only examine the plantations fronting on the East Branch; notwithstanding this limitation, I suggest that historical archaeologists should consider the social and cultural impact of surrounding plantations in future studies.

A natural progression of this study is to apply a model, which can attempt to interpret spatially the phenomena identified in this chapter with other phenomena. In the next three chapters I present a theory-based cognitive predictive model (chapter five) for investigating perceived past landscapes from the viewpoint of the planter-elite and enslaved laborers using viewshed analysis.
(chapter six). The perceived landscape is further investigated for possible areas of mobility by the enslaved laborers using least cost surface analysis (chapter seven).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation</th>
<th>Date Acquired</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Elias Ball II</td>
<td>(1709-1786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elias Ball III</td>
<td>(1752-1810)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Isaac Ball</td>
<td>(1785-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elias Ball II</td>
<td>(1709-1786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Ball Sr.</td>
<td>(1760-1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>John Ball Jr.</td>
<td>(1782-1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elias Ball</td>
<td>(1744-1822)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Elias Ball II</td>
<td>(1709-1786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Ball Sr.</td>
<td>(1760-1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Isaac Ball</td>
<td>(1785-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James/Saw Mill</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elias Ball II</td>
<td>(1709-1786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Ball Sr.</td>
<td>(1760-1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Isaac Ball</td>
<td>(1785-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>Early 1800s</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Ball Sr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Ball</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1760-1817)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1785-1825)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comingtee</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elias Ball Sr. (1709-1786)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elias Ball III (1752-1810)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Ball Jr. (1782-1834)</td>
<td>Nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishpond &amp; Hut</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Harleston Jr. (1756-1783)</td>
<td>Cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1782</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Edward Harleston (1761-1825)</td>
<td>Cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Harleston (1757-1816)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishpond</td>
<td>&gt;1788</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Edward Harleston (1761-1825)</td>
<td>Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hut</td>
<td>&gt;1788</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>William Harleston (1757-1816)</td>
<td>Brother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 Group III: circa 1783 to 1820s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation</th>
<th>Date Acquired</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonneau</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Samuel Bonneau (1725-1788)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Benjamin Bonneau (b. 1721)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Floride Bonneau Colhoun (1764-1836)</td>
<td>Daughter of Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elizabeth Lynch Harleston (b. 1756)</td>
<td>Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>James Hamilton Sr. (1750-1833)</td>
<td>Husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178?</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Colonel Daniel Huger Horry II (1737-1785)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Frederick Wilkes Rutledge (1769-1821)</td>
<td>Son-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond &amp; Farmfield</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel John Harleston (1738-1793)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elizabeth Faucheraud Harleston (1749-1805)</td>
<td>Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Jane Smith Harleston Rutledge (1773-1835)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Nicholas Harleston Rutledge (1809-1835)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Sarah Hasell Harleston Huger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmfield</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Elizabeth Harleston Corbett (1800-1865)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harleston Corbett (1770-1837)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossis</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Colonel John Harleston (1738-1793)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Nicholas Posthumous Harleston (1768-1832)</td>
<td>Half-brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Edward Harleston (1761-1825)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Joseph Brown (d.&gt;1806)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Major Evan Edwards (1752-1798)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Catherine Jones Edwards (1785-&gt;1840)</td>
<td>Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Poyas (1787-1824)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Poyas (1792-1877)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Robert Quash (1700-1772)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Robert Quash II (1740-1811)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Robert Hasell Quash (1786-1840)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Gabriel Manigault (1704-1781)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Gabriel Manigault II (1758-1809)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Nathaniel Heyward (1766-1851)</td>
<td>Brother-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Richard Shubrick</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquired</td>
<td>(1751-1777)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Thomas Shubrick</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1711-1779)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Colonel Thomas Shubrick</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1756-1810)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Roger Pinckney</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1770-1851)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Trustees or John Ball</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1760-1817)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Devise or</td>
<td>Isaac Ball</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>(1785-1825)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pompion Hill</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Samuel Thomas</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1747</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b. 1748)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Colonel Thomas Shubrick</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1756-1810)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>William Barnett</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Gabriel Manigault</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1758-1809)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Nathaniel Heyward</td>
<td>Brother-in-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1766-1851)</td>
<td>law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Alfred Huger</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1788-1872)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleburg</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Benjamin Simons III</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1736-1789)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Sara Lydia Simons Lucas</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons Ville/Horts</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Catherine Simons Hort (1782-1834)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokey Hill</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Mary Simons Maybank (1777-1806)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Vere</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Benjamin Simons III (1736-1789)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>John Bryan (1754-1805)</td>
<td>Son-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Lydia Ball Simons Bryan (1757-1843)</td>
<td>Wife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 Group VI: circa 1783 to 1820s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation</th>
<th>Date Acquired</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blessing</td>
<td>&gt;1760</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>John Deas Sr. (1735-1790)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>John Deas Jr. (d. 1790)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Archibald Broûn (1752-1797)</td>
<td>Brother-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Purchase?</td>
<td>John Holman Sr. (d. 1792)</td>
<td>European African Slave Trader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Purchase?</td>
<td>Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821)</td>
<td>*parallel title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Holman Jr. (1763-1821)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821)</td>
<td>*parallel title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Margaret Harleston Corbett Laurens (1805-1850)</td>
<td>Daughter-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Jordan Myrick (1785-1834)</td>
<td>Overseer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Half interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hill</td>
<td>&gt;1760</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Deas Sr. (1735-1790)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Deas Jr. (1735-1790)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Archibald Broûn (1752-1797)</td>
<td>Son-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>William Wragg Smith (1808-1875)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill</td>
<td>&gt;1760</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Deas Sr. (1735-1790)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Deas Jr. (1735-1790)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Archibald Broün (1752-1797)</td>
<td>Son-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Henry Laurens Jr. (1763-1821)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Harriott Horry Laurens Ingraham (1813-1888)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagan</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Huger I (1744-1804)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Daniel Elliott Huger (1749-1858)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Law Suit</td>
<td>John Huger II (1786-1853)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akinfield</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>James Akin II (1743-1783)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>John Huger I (1744-1804)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Huger II (1786-1853)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Thomas Withers (d.1796)</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Russell Deveaux (b. 1737)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(775 a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Deveaux (b. 1762)</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Deveaux (b. 1760)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Deveaux Roddam (b. 1758)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1779</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>John Huger I (1744-1804)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(775 a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(115 a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(500 a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Alfred Huger</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1788-1872)</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Gordon (1787-1835)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard/Benevento (portion of Hagan Plantation)</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>John Huger I (1744-1804)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Daniel Elliott Huger (1749-1858)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Dr. Benjamin Huger (1793-1874)</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Thomas Dearington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(500 a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Devise/Trust</td>
<td>John Huger I, trustee (1744-1804)</td>
<td>Sons¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William, Thomas &amp; Joseph Mayer¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Resurvey</td>
<td>William, Thomas &amp; Joseph Mayer¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Richard Dearington¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87.5 a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d. 1789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87.5 a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Robert (d. 1793), Thomas (d. 1794), &amp; John Dearington</td>
<td>Sons¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Purchase?</td>
<td>Thomas Dearington</td>
<td>Brother¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Robert Dearington¹ (d. 1793) or Thomas Robert Dearington</td>
<td>Son¹ or Nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Date Acquired</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Ann Rees Dearington(^1)</td>
<td>Wife &amp; son(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel John Darrington(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1762-1813)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Colonel John Darrington(^1)</td>
<td>Son(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1786-1855)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Colonel Jacob Bond I'On</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1782-1859)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Per Bacot
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devised</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer/Lawsuit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent to Son</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent to Daughter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband to Wife</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife to Husband</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin, Uncle, Nephew, Niece</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To In-Law (brother or son)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To an Overseer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other East Branch Connection</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No East Branch Connection</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 Family Names Associated with East Branch Plantations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation (initial date of existence)</th>
<th>Family Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akinfield/Woodland (1694)</td>
<td>Akin - Amory - Fling - Harleston - Huger - Lloyd - Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard/Benevento (1819) portion of Hagan</td>
<td>Huger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneau Ferry (1680)</td>
<td>Bonneau - Colhoun - Guérard - Mayrant - Prioleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossis (1680)</td>
<td>Guérard - Bosse - Blake - Harleston - Quattlebaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Vere (1785) portion of Middleburg</td>
<td>Bryan – Simons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hill (1790) portion of Blessing</td>
<td>Broün - Deas – Laurens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill (1790) portion of Blessing</td>
<td>Broün - Deas – Laurens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comingtee/Stoke (1694)</td>
<td>Ball – Harleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmfield (1680)</td>
<td>Guérard - Harleston – Corbett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbrook (1724) portion of Cypress Barony</td>
<td>Arthur - Broün - Quash – Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishpond (1780) portion of Comingtee</td>
<td>Harleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagan (1688)</td>
<td>Belin - Bonneau - Bonny - Darney - Ford -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation (initial date of existence)</td>
<td>Family Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hut (1780)</td>
<td>Gunn - Huger - Miller - Moore - Monck - Poole - Rhett - Torquett - Trott - Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of Comingtee</td>
<td>Harleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park (1742)</td>
<td>Ball – Gough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of Cypress Barony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Town (&gt;1748)</td>
<td>Akin – Harleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho (1718/19)</td>
<td>Ball - Harris - Huger – Mayrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington (1740)</td>
<td>Ball – Gough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of Cypress Barony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick (1681)</td>
<td>Ball - Gough - Huger - Mahon - Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of Cypress Barony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleburg (1693)</td>
<td>Bryan - DuPré - Hort – Simons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway (&gt;1800s)</td>
<td>Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooreland/Brickyard (1701)</td>
<td>Deveau - Huger - Lynch - Roddam - Russell - Stone - Withers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickelson (1724)</td>
<td>Arthur - Edwards - Osborn - Nickelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinby (&gt;1726)</td>
<td>Ashby - Ball - Pinckney – Shubrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Barony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond (1680)</td>
<td>Guérard - Harleston - Huger - Martine - Rutledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation (initial date of existence)</td>
<td>Family Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Hope (1683)</td>
<td>Heyward - Johnson – Manigault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons Ville/Horts (1789) portion of Middleburg</td>
<td>Bryan - Hort – Simons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokey Hill (1789) portion of Middleburg</td>
<td>Bryan - Maybank – Simons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James/Saw Mill (&gt; 1747)</td>
<td>Ball – Gough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa/Harriett’s (1680)</td>
<td>Guérard - Hamilton - Harleston - Huger – Rutledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor (1739) portion of Cypress Barony</td>
<td>Brown - Edwards - Harleston - Poyas - Roche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 4.1 Map showing the Plantations along the Cooper River as they were in the year 1842 (source: Irving 1842).
CHAPTER FIVE
COGNITIVE PREDICTIVE MODEL

Predictive modeling in archaeology is a hot topic for exploring socially relevant problems (González-Tennant 2016; Kamermans 2000:142; Kantner and Hobgood 2016; Stančič and Kvarme 1999; Van Hove 2004; Verhagen and Whitley 2011; Whitley and Hicks 2003). Modeling is a heuristic tool for projecting known patterns or relationships into unknown times or places based on a correlation between settlement and environment (Llobera 1996:612-22). Modeling emerged out of settlement archaeology and assumed that site location patterns can be established for a particular cultural area. A settlement pattern, an observed pattern, is a non-random distribution of archaeological sites on a landscape. A settlement system, a theoretical concept, is the cultural adaptation that produced the observed distribution pattern of archaeological sites. Researchers in academia and CRM are not only interested in where settlements are but they are asking questions about the spatial behavior of past people.

Archaeologists employ models to predict where undocumented areas of activity might be found with similar cultural settings. Early studies relied on distinguishing between sites and non-sites (presence or absence of activity). With the advancement of technology (GIS), lower costs in hardware (desktop
computers), and free digital datasets, the use of predictive modeling increased in cultural resource management (CRM) and academic research (Kantner and Hobgood 2016; Kvanmme and Kohler 1998; Westcott and Brandon 2002). At the basic level, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) provides a visual representation of data in a map format. With the incorporation of GIS into research studies, however, planimetric maps are no longer the end-product rather with technology, and as a tool for geostatistical analysis, GIS provides quantitative and qualitative benefits to address theoretical questions. As a tool, GIS enhances modeling the real world and serves as a guide for future archaeological fieldwork.

This chapter focuses on cognition, decision-making, and predictive modeling. After a general discussion of the concepts, discussion turns to the techniques employed in the model that address the dissertation research questions. Every landscape is composed of natural and social ‘resources’ that are distributed unequally over the landscape. The methodology employed in the study area addresses the influences of human ‘behavior’ (activities or practices) in spatial-temporal terms at the regional scale from two viewpoints. The first viewpoint is that of the dominant class: how did the planter-elite arrange their plantations to re-enforce their ideology of surveillance and control? The interpretation of viewsheds and intervisibility analyses will either support or
invalidate the theory that planter-elites controlled the enslaved laborers via the natural and/or built landscape (analysis appears in chapter six). The second viewpoint is that of the subordinate class, the enslaved laborers: how did the slave laborers create pathways that circumvented the planter-elite’s surveillance and control? The combination of least path analysis and viewsheds will either support or invalidate that the enslaved laborers were to create paths that resisted perceived planter-elite surveillance and control (analysis appears in chapter seven).

The first research question is how did the planter-elite arrange their plantations, given the physical landscape, to re-enforce their ideology of surveillance and control? This question was approached through the creation of viewsheds and intervisibility analyses. The second research question is from the viewpoint of the enslaved laborers. If the planter-elite believed they had control over their landscape, then how did the enslaved laborers move through this perceived landscape? This question was addressed through cost-surface analysis. Various least cost analyses are explored to locate probable paths, corridors, or networks that the enslaved laborers may have used to move through the ‘actual and perceived’ landscape. The results are discussed in chapter seven.

In using this model to identify the probable paths, corridors, or networks, archaeologists could predict probable locations of activity for future excavations.
Addressing these research questions expands our understanding of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Lowcountry rice plantation landscapes, particularly from the cognitive perspective of enslaved laborers. In the final section, the datasets used in the cognitive predictive model are presented.

Cognition and Decision-Making

Decision-making is a topic of research in psychology, computer science, and philosophy; albeit, in terms of spatial patterning, decision-making is in the domain of geography (c.f. Tobler 1993), economics, sociology, and linguistics. Economists, statisticians, psychologists, political and social scientists, and philosophers have a deep history of studying decision theory (c.f. Hansson 1994, revised 2005). According to Hansson, decision theory or theory of choice is concerned with the choices of individual agents.

Theorists employ two approaches to decision-making studies. Scholars who employ the normative approach are concerned with how the best decisions are made based upon a set of uncertain beliefs and a set of values. On the other hand, scholars who employ the descriptive approach are concerned with analyzing how existing, possibly irrational agents actually make decisions. Both approaches assume that the best decision made results from perfect accuracy of information and with full rationality. In other words, people made the decisions that they ‘ought’ to make according to the acceptable norms. To take the analysis
another step further, a positive descriptive approach involves ‘observable’
behaviors of agents based on certain consistent rules within a prescribed
procedural framework.

When considering mobility within a prescribed landscape, humans
acquire the necessary information about their surroundings either through direct
perception using their senses, such as vision, hearing, taste, touch, and smell or
through indirect methods, such as second-hand descriptions, previous
experience, or speculation. Decisions could be made consciously (short-term
memory) or subconsciously (long-term memory) (c.f. Kihlstrom 1987). Choices
structure the natural and social landscape and, in turn, choices are structured by
the landscape.

Risk is inherently a part of decision-making. In the context of enslaved
labor, some risks might be small, such as a work slowdown while other risks had
enormous implications, both positive and negative, such as running away.
Decisions made on partial or incomplete information increased risks. For
instance, one may be very familiar with his or her local surroundings, but
unfamiliar with the landscape beyond. Often, but not absolutely, humans
employ a system of comparing the benefits and costs of their actions; however,
one may not be fully aware of the rationale for the action taken. Some enslaved
laborers made decisions based on risk avoidance, such as physical punishment,
over achieving gain, such as a reward. Inherently, archaeological analyses tend to focus on the ‘known unknowns’ and not the ‘unknown unknowns’; in other words, the focus is upon expected outcomes and not unforeseen events.

**Predictive Modeling**

Predictive modeling is useful for identifying, or predicting, probable locations and probable types of activity areas in regions without previous archaeological site information. The primary arenas using predictive modeling in archaeology are cultural resource management and academic research (Kamermans 2000, 2004; Verhagen and Whitley 2011). In cultural resource management (CRM) and planning projects, the focus of research is in predicting the location of archaeological sites and/or features based upon known sites and/or features to either mitigate adverse effects upon archaeological resources and/or to reduce the cost of traditional archaeological surveys on such projects. In academic research, more interest is placed on the degree to which environmental and social variables influenced settlement patterns than mere correlation of the variables.

Traditionally, predictive modelers employ one of two approaches: inductive and deductive. The inductive approach relies upon quantitative relationships between locations and environment. For example, Wiley’s (1953) study of the Virú Valley set the tone for archaeologists interested in locating
settlements by correlating natural environmental variables with past settlements. Any time the environmental variables (such as water or soil) correlated with archaeological sites/features, the assumption followed that the results should be the same if conditions were similar, regardless of the study area. Generally, inductive models were not driven by theory but rather were driven by observation. Further, archaeologists made observations and assumed causality from a simple correlation between known sites and modern environmental variables. Thus, archaeologists extrapolated their results from one site to other sites without known archaeological information. The inductive approach provided only generalized, non-cumulative study-dependent results without addressing theoretical questions (van Leusen 1993, 1995; Wansleeben and Verhart 1992, 1997). In purely inductive approaches, little effort was attempted to understand the cultural or environmental factors that caused correlations. Therefore, the findings were site-dependent, valid for that site alone, and not applicable to other study areas.

In a different manner, users of a deductive predictive model incorporated anthropological, historical, and archaeological knowledge-based theory-driven hypotheses, particularly economic behavior (Kamermans 2000:125; van Leusen 2002; Verhagen and Whitley 2011). The deductive approach recognized that humans consciously select particular settlement locations based on a set of
physical environmental preferences and social needs. Archaeologists began with a model of cultural adaption and deduced from the distribution of resources, not only physical location but also types of sites. Extending beyond the inductive approach, the deductive approach not only predicted where sites were located but also why sites were located where they were. In contrast, the deductive approach linked theory to environmental variables and human behavior.

In *The Fundamental Principles and Practice of Predictive Archaeological Modeling*, Kenneth Kvamme (1990b) provided a theoretical foundation for placing inductive and deductive predictive modeling into a hybrid conceptual framework. According to Kvamme, a successful predictive model minimized the classification error (sites versus non-sites) and represented a more accurate model than random chance models. In other words, predictive models must be more robust than merely determining whether an archaeological site exists (presence) or not (absence) or merely ‘throwing a dart’ at the landscape in the hopes of locating an archaeological site. Since archaeological sites represent human behavior and settlements are not randomly located, then it follows that if preferred locations are known then it is possible to predict the location of archaeological sites within some degree of accuracy. Van Leusen referred to these as possibilistic, which suggests how suitable a site is for activity. Robust models should return a high probability rate more than eighty-five percent that
would identify site locations (Kvamme 1990b); however, van Leusen (2002) states that models rarely return rates of more than seventy percent.

Both inductive and deductive approaches have their criticisms. Critics referred to predictive models as ‘intuitive’ or ‘expert judgment’ (Verhagen and Whitley 2012). Both models were highly criticized for being susceptible to environmental determinism and ecological fallacy (c.f. Gaffney and van Leusen 1995). Inductive modeling was criticized for being self-fulfilling because only areas with known archaeological sites/features were tested as well as for perpetuating the idea that some sites were more important than other sites were. For example, David Wheatley (2004) argued that landscapes are far too complex to be reduced to simple self-fulfilling findings.

A major criticism of deductive approaches is that assumptions must be made about past human interactions with the past environment and about how those interactions resulted in a specific spatial pattern in particular areas. In the case of pre-historic peoples, assumptions beyond subsistence activities biased the model’s predictions (Delaware Department of Transportation 2005:41). Moreover, archaeologists are limited in the reconstruction of a paleo-environment by modern datasets that may not accurately reflect conditions of the period in question. For instance, how accurate is distance to water, if the location
of the river moved over time? Therefore, reliance on inaccurate datasets introduces inherent errors in the model.

Reconstructing past environments is not only problematic for pre-historic archaeologists but also is problematic for historic archaeologists as well. Charles Fithian’s 2005 work on early seventeenth- and eighteenth-century European settlements in Kent and Sussex Counties, Delaware is an example of inaccurate dataset usage. Fithian relied on historic maps that contained inaccurate transportation routes and settlement locations. Following the known theoretical correlation of plantation sites with agricultural activities, Fithian found an association of plantation settlements with high-quality soils; however, he could not identify a single variable or set of variables that would aid in predicting the location of these sites on the landscape (Delaware 2005:23). For example, proximity to water proved useless as a criterion for settlement location. Initial early settlement patterns were oriented toward and along navigable waters. Later, a vast inland road system connected the riverine settlements to each other. During the second quarter of the eighteenth century, settlement patterns shifted from a water-orientation to an interior-orientation. Nineteenth-century transportation systems continued to influence settlement patterns along rail lines and canals. Therefore, Fithian concluded that the archaeological potential for this
period would be difficult to model without appropriate variables such as historic transportation routes (Delaware 2005:24).

**Cognitive Predictive Modeling**

As early as 1986, Thomas Huffman (1986:84-95) defined cognitive archaeology as “the study of prehistoric ideology: the ideals, values, and beliefs that constituted a society’s worldview.” Beginning in the 1990s, scholars began focusing on understanding how people inhabited and used their environment from a cognitive perspective. In the sub-field of landscape archaeology, for example, Bender (1993) and Tilley (1993, 1994) introduced additional predictors that determined behavior: social and cultural factors. Further, Renfrew and Zubrow (1994) included social (cognitive) aspects in ‘cognitive archaeology.’ The post-processualists ‘humanized’ space as deriving meaning from the presence of observers. This post-processual theoretical perspective focused on the ways ancient societies thought and their perceived symbolic structure in material culture. Early studies focused on ideology, religious thought, and cosmology (Flannery and Marcus 1983; Renfrew 1985, Renfrew and Zubrow 1993). Because proponents of processual archaeology expressed skepticism about the validity of ‘knowing’ what people in the past thought or why they made certain decisions, there were few early proponents of cognitive archaeology. Perception and
cognition are two separate concepts (van Leusen 2002). Van Leusen states that perception is being aware of landscape and that cognition modifies perception.

Cognitive predictive modeling has been particularly useful for pre-historic archaeologists interested in understanding the worldview of the people being studied (Kamermans 2000; Ridges 2006; Stančič and Kvmme 1999; van Hove 2004). For instance, Ridges mapped the distribution of Aboriginal archaeological features using predictive modeling in the context of cultural heritage conservation. Stančič and Kvmme, using Boolean overlays and Map Algebra, focused on modeling archaeological settlement distributions of Bronze Age hillforts from the island of Brač in central Dalmatia, Croatia. Inspired by Thomas Whitley’s cognitive model, Van Hove modeled the effects of agency and economic space in Neolithic southern Calabria (2004:284). Other scholars who employed the cognitive predictive modeling framework include Whitley (2003, 2005) on American slave societies, Burns *et al.* (2008) on an Egyptian necropolis, and Peeters (2007) on long-term hunter-gatherer subsistence dynamics.

Stančič and Kvmme (1999) paid attention to social variables as ‘predictors.’ Based on their knowledge of the study area and previous fieldwork, they identified four social variables that influenced the location of hillforts. The four variables included: (1) distance to hillforts as economic territories, (2) intervisibility between hillforts over large territory and overlooking other
hillforts, (3) distance from the coast for protection from pirates and other raiders, and (4) location of barrows that appear at certain distances from hillforts.

Several American historical archaeologists also focused on material expressions of human ways of thinking in areas such as gender, class, status, and kinship. For example, James Deetz approached the study of material culture and cognition in New England and the Virginia Tidewater from the early seventeenth century as well as in the nineteenth century English frontier in South Africa (c.f. Deetz 1974, 1978). Deetz’s studies examined the impact of mind (cognition) on the shape, form, and use of material culture. At the same time, landscape archaeologists began examining the ways people influenced their environment and the ways both people and their environment intersected and affected each other (c.f. Taylor and Johnston 1995; Wheatley 1993).

In 2010, Hans Kamermans identified Thomas Whitley (2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d, 2003, 2004, and 2005) as the most promising scholar who incorporated cognitive predictive modeling in both cultural resource management and academic research. In the early twenty-first century, Whitley (2002b, 2003) employed GIS to “outline and understand the ways in which people have thought about and utilized their surroundings.” Whitley developed a framework within GIS that represented “the cognitive perspective of the
people who actually deposited archaeological material” (2008b). Further, in quoting Whitley from his study of enslaved laborers in the Georgia Lowcountry:

[t]his require[d] thinking about not just how the enslaved used the environment in the past, but how their ideas and behavior were influenced by how they envisioned their environment to be, and how those ideas and behaviors change[d] over time ... particularly ... combined with ... social control and direct manipulation of the landscape (both actual and perceived) (Whitley 2008b:8-9).

The nature of cognitive predictive modeling is based on ‘perceived’ group norms and values. Norms are the socially shared acceptable behaviors of society. Individuals learn the ‘rules’ of behavior as young children and these rules are reinforced over time. People learn how to act in particular situations. Violations of the ‘rules,’ such as taboos or deviant behavior, lead to social punishments. Values are the abstract thoughts of what is right or wrong, based upon acceptable or unacceptable norms. Norms and values help to create and maintain an orderly society. All societies have norms and values that constitute what is typical or average behavior for certain situations and the average person is expected to act/react in predictable ways. However, at various times, individual behavior within the larger group can become context-specific based on one’s social position. Therefore, predictive modeling and material culture, as studied by archaeologists, represents actions of the group (an average) and not of the individual (the infinitesimal possibilities).
Methodological Framework

Verhagen and Whitley (2012) discuss a vast amount of theoretical literature from several disciplines, which archaeologists apply to research, such as optimal foraging theory, diet-breadth model, central place foraging, and prospect theory, to name but a few. Verhagen and Whitley’s (2012) framework for implementing principles of cognitive archaeology with archaeological theory in predictive modeling influenced methods undertaken in this dissertation.

Verhagen and Whitley suggested the incorporation of theory into predictive modeling by applying a combination of cognitive archeological principles and post-depositional process analysis (2012:70). Whitley argued that although early post-processualists rejected Binford’s middle range theory (c.f. Hodder 1991), his concept was appropriate for integrating theory into predictive modeling. Lewis Binford’s middle range theory links human behavior and natural processes to physical remains in the archaeological record. For Binford, “the archaeologist’s task ... lies in abstracting from cultural products the normative concepts extant in the minds of men now dead” (1965:196). The fundamental assumption of middle range theory is that evidence from contemporary people is applicable to people in the past.

Additionally, Verhagen and Whitley (2012:62-63) advanced the incorporation of agency in predictive modeling. Proponents of agency theory
studies are concerned with how social behavior rules apply to individuals over time. By incorporating an agency model (passive or active), archaeologists can theorize a ‘perspective’ of the agent by examining the spatial basis of decision-making. Furthermore, archaeologists are focusing more on the individual in terms of phenomenology and agency (c.f. Thomas 2008).

Whitley’s cognitive predictive modeling approach (Figure 5.1) results in a final assessment that contains a probability formula, which produces the ‘possible’ location of artifacts and/or features (Whitley 2005, 2012:72). Whitley stated that it is important to note that not all behaviors resulted in the deposition of artifacts and/or features; therefore, the absence of archaeological remains was just as revealing as the presence of them. Furthermore, it is equally important to recognize that the absence of deposits does not equate to the avoidance of certain areas. Avoidance may have occurred for various reasons. Landscapes are not static. Over time, settlement activity creates a landscape palimpsest that archaeologists can reveal through excavation and interpretation. Whitley emphasizes that within his site selection framework, past cognition does not result in ‘sites’ but rather results in spatially dispersed material, which represent broad categories of past human behavior. Whitley concludes that, “these material by-products (through survey and excavation) and classifying them into meaningful clusters (i.e. sites) completes the causal chain” (2012:73).
A model cannot tell us exactly where activity occurred; but rather it can identify the most ‘probable’ locations for activity. In this dissertation, one task of the cognitive predictive model is to reveal the locations of ‘possible’ spatial patterns where archaeological remains might be found. One crucial research question for the study of the East Branch is whether the location of specific plantation, their layout and proximity to other plantations, influenced the cognitive mobility decision-making of the enslaved laborers. Ultimately, evaluation focuses on ‘perception’ rather than the ‘actuality’ of cost and benefits inherent in mobility of the enslaved laborers. Per Gaffney et al. (1996), perception and cognition are two separate concepts; cognition modifies perception. Therefore, perception is being aware of the landscape. Per Whitley, “a cognitive cost-benefit approach will ... almost never be a clear-cut case” (2012:82). Whitley proposes that a multiple modeling framework, specifying more than one option from different perspectives, offers either the most probable answer or at the very least, a few probable ones.

Van Leusen (2002) suggests an alternative framework based on aims rather than a methodological or theoretical stance. Specifically, van Leusen asserts that the type of research question determines methodological possibilities and constraints. Per van Leusen, models are either correlative or explanatory. If the aim is to understand aspects of past settlement and land use behavior, then
the purpose of the model is explanatory, testing an understanding of the study area. If the aim is to conserve an archaeological site, then the purpose of the model is correlative, estimating the probable archaeological presence in the study area. The two aims result in distinct outcomes: explanatory models are possibilistic whereas correlative models are probabilistic. Explanatory models “assume that past societies have a particular structure and economies, and that taphonomic and post-depositional processes … that transform their remains into the current soil archives [archaeological remains]” (van Leusen 2002:5.7). On the other hand, correlative models “assume that available archaeological data are representative of discovered and undiscovered remains … in general … and that better (more, and more detailed) data and statistical techniques will result in better predictions” (van Leusen 2002:5.7).

This dissertation examines not only how the East Branch planter-elites designed their landscape to surveil and to exert psychological control over their enslaved population (analysis in chapter six) but also how the enslaved population moved through the ‘actual and perceived’ landscape (analysis in chapter seven).

**GIS and Modeling**

As a tool, GIS-driven models have the capability of improving our understanding of temporal change by comparing spatial patterns over time.
Early adoption of the potential of GIS for archaeological work began with the work of Dutch archaeologist Kenneth L. Kvamme who presented a paper at the 1985 Society for American Archaeology (SAA) on the use of GIS for regional archaeological research (Chapman 2006:17). Kvamme introduced the inductive method, widely followed in CRM where the focus is on management, protection, and preservation of archaeological sites or artifacts. In the United States, Timothy A. Kohler and Sandra C. Parker (1986) were the first to use GIS in an archaeological context to predict archaeological site location within a management context. Kohler and Parker (1986:40) offered the first definition of predictive modeling using GIS: “predictive locational models attempt to predict, at a minimum, the location of archaeological sites or materials in a region, based either on a sample of that region or on fundamental notions concerning human behavior.” In furthering the use of modeling, Sebastian and Judge (1988:1) stated that, “one of the more interesting developments in archaeology in the recent past is the emergence of predictive modeling as an integral component of the discipline.”

At the 1996 New Orleans SAA, Konnie L. Westcott and R. Joe Brandon held the first organized GIS-focused symposium for the archaeological community. Participants focused on the application and caveats of predictive modeling using GIS. Out of the symposium, the organizers’ edited book (2000)
represented the body of research at the time for applying GIS and predictive modeling to the landscape. At the time, Westcott predicted that as GIS became a “fundamental component of archaeological method, [it was] likely to have an increasing impact on archaeological theory” (2000:1). Indeed, using GIS as a tool to explore human interaction with the historic landscape is more than just a catchphrase.

Archaeologists in the United States, Canada, and the Netherlands routinely use predictive modeling. For example, the state of Minnesota created the MN/Model, a collection of twenty-four regional models, one per physiographic province in the state. This model incorporated perspectives from archaeologists, geomorphologists, and GIS specialists who established procedures, workflows, and accuracy criteria, which reduced costs by millions of dollars spent on site mitigation projects (Hudak et al. 2000). The Dutch model, Indicative Kaart Van Archeologische Waarden (IKAW), identifies areas of high, medium, or low archaeological potential in heritage management (van Leusen and Kamermans 2005).

The leading software platform for GIS is Environmental Systems and Research Institute (ESRI), which originally launched in 1969 as a land-use consulting firm. In 1981, ESRI launched ARC/INFO (now ArcGIS for Desktop Advanced). ESRI defined GIS as an organized collection of computer hardware,
software, geographic data, and personnel designed to efficiently capture, store, update, manipulate, analyze, and display all forms of geographically referenced information (ESRI 1995).

GIS analyzes spatial data in a way that can reconstruct the past environment and create artificial surfaces that represent an approximation of the Earth’s surface. Overwhelmingly, prehistoric archaeologists have utilized the benefits of GIS. Historical archaeologists are just beginning to understand the benefits of GIS for their research (González-Tennant 2016). In fact, in his review of the literature for the use of GIS in historical archaeology, González-Tennant advocates that GIS should become a practice rather than merely a tool or “simple software (e.g. Excel)” to support “a deeper engagement with the technology” (2016:25). With GIS as part of the archaeologist’s toolkit/practice, artifact and feature densities can be interpolated, datasets queried and correlated, and data combined, extracted, and presented in a spatial overlay with surface landmarks for reconstructing and identifying past behaviors. Early prehistoric archaeology models were used either for suitability studies or for extrapolating environmental variables to build correlative statistical summaries. González-Tennant identifies three categories of historical archaeological GIS: inventory and geospatial database management (primarily for CRM); geospatial analysis such as predictive modeling, viewshed analysis, least-cost path analysis, and dataset
comparison; and mapmaking and data visualization. As more graduate students are trained in landscape theory and GIS, the field should witness an upsurge in historical archaeological GIS in the twenty-first century.

In modeling cognitive landscapes, scholars employ two types of models to simulate past human behavior: visibility and accessibility. Additionally, González-Tennant (2016:28) identified a third model rarely employed by historical archaeologists: locational modeling, generally used for calculating site catchment. The next section of this chapter presents the methods of analysis employed to test research questions in the East Branch study area. Tools in the ArcGIS 10.5.1 Spatial Analyst Extension were employed for the analyses. Unlike previous versions of ArcGIS software, this version accounts for the earth’s curvature, which is a quadratic function of distance.

**Visibility Analysis**

Visibility analysis (VA) studies have a long history in archeology. In CRM, archeologists used visual impact studies to reconstruct ancient road systems, to understand pre-historic ritual landscapes, and to question why objects and/or terrain features are present within a viewshed (Fisher et al.1997; Kay and Sly 2001; Lake and Woodman 2003; Ruggles et al.1993; van Leusen 1993:118-121; Wheatley 1995, 1996). A few historical archaeologists employed viewshed analysis in their studies, especially in modelling cognitive historic landscapes.
These historical archeologists employed visual analysis to investigate surveillance and social control on plantations.

Gaffney et al. (1996:27-41) linked cognition with visibility,

A viewshed represents the area in which a location or monument may communicate visual information. Viewsheds may overlap, producing zones in which an observer might be aware of the presence of many such locations, all of which may carry information. The increased density of such information can in some circumstances be interpreted as a measure of the importance of a particular area. It provides a spatial index of perception, mapping the cognitive landscape within which the monuments operated.

VA is a quick methodology that indicates intervisibility between two points on the landscape. In its simplest format, a simple line of sight (LoS) analysis produces a binary raster that returns a value for cells that are visible (1) and non-visible (0). In contrast, a viewshed identifies the areas that can be seen from one or more observation points. Viewsheds are useful for determining how visible locations on the landscape are from a specific vantage point. With several observation points, viewsheds determine which observers can see each observed location in the landscape. Knowing which locations are observable affects decision-making for mobility through the landscape.

An important factor affecting visibility is distance; the average person can see another person’s head at five hundred feet (152.40 meters), although just as a
blur (Loftus 2005). Drawing from other disciplines, archaeologists have found several ways to incorporate different variables in their models. For example, Fisher (1994) and Ogburn (2006) applied the theory of distance decay to create fuzzy viewsheds that accounted for the decrease of visibility with distance. Landscape architect Tadahido Higuchi (1983) developed several distance calculations to account for varying distances (c.f. La Kose 2004; Wheatley and Gilling 2000:14-23). Higuchi based one set of distance calculations on the amount of time a person spent viewing objects within the landscape. Higuchi stated that people tend to spend sixty percent of time on objects at the near distance of less than fifteen meters, with forty percent of that time falling in the two- to fifteen-meter range. Ten percent of viewing time is spent on objects at middle distances of fifteen to one hundred fifty meters and thirty percent of time on objects more than one hundred fifty meters to the horizon.

Higuchi developed another distance calculation that accounts for visual acuity. In the short range of less than three hundred sixty meters, an individual object is distinguishable and has a sensory impact. While most viewshed analyses focus exclusively on sight over other the senses, perhaps just knowing or being aware of a social activity is equally as important, such as a fire (smell) or drumming (sound). Sound and smell are included sensory impacts. Higuchi labeled the middle range, three hundred sixty meters to six hundred sixty
meters, as the ‘pictorial’ landscape where clear vision is paramount. For any distance in excess of sixty-six hundred meters, he considered as a ‘vertical backdrop’ featuring the horizon.

Wheatley (1995:171-186) fine-tuned the basic VA with his Cumulative Viewshed Analysis (CVA) model. Wheatley’s CVA creates a series of individual viewsheds that are summed together to create a single map, which reveals how much a portion of the landscape is visible from the observation points. The benefit of CVA is the ability to analyze and rank social ordering of space.

In the East Branch study, CVA was employed to test the perceived visual control of the planter-elite. A background CVA was created to ascertain the ‘natural’ visibility of the East Branch community. Because the planter-elite settled along the river, several observer points were placed along the river at a point closest to or opposite the location of known planter-elite houses. The purpose of this CVA was to establish a ‘control’ to investigate whether the landscape alone or in combination with house siting created controlling viewsheds.

Observers points were created in separate point shapefiles at the known centroid of each big house and each enslaved laborer quarters. The height of the average observer was specified as 1.5 meters. Then comparative CVA were created for interpretation. One CVA was created from the viewpoint of the multiple planter-elites and another CVA was created from the viewpoint of the
enslaved laborer quarters. The purpose of the CVA is to address several theoretical questions. (1) As a close-knit kin-based community, were the planter-elite settlements situated to maintain visual control over their own and their neighbor’s enslaved population? If so, to what degree was their control? (2) What was within the visual purview of the enslaved laborers within this planter-elite dominated landscape? (3) Is it possible to statistically evaluate areas of greater or lesser visual control using CVA? Theory, analysis, and discussion appear in chapter six.

In setting parameters for the East Branch model, Higuchi’s time factors were not employed, however, his distance parameters were useful. Buffers were created at fifteen meters, one hundred fifty meters, and the maximum distance threshold was set at one thousand meters. Another set of buffers were created for vision acuity at three hundred sixty meters (sensory impact), three hundred sixty to six hundred sixty meters (perfect vision), and the maximum threshold maintained at one thousand meters.

**Least Cost Analysis**

Least Cost Analysis (LCA) focuses on movement of humans along potential pathways. Geographers, urban planners, psychologists, and others use LCA frequently in decision-making studies (Livingood 2012:175). The theory behind LCA is that humans will make decisions about travel that will limit their
‘costs’ of travel. The choice of which path(s) to take is based on the common notion that humans will exert the least amount of energy (caloric expenditure) or choose the shortest route to their destination. In other words, humans are likely to travel to places they can reach easily or spend less energy in travelling. These costs can be determined in one or more ways. Cumulative costs consider the distance traveled. Duration or time costs consider how long it takes to make the journey (c.f. Tobler’s Hiking Function 1993). Finally, energetic or caloric costs consider how much energy is expended to make the journey (c.f. Pandolf et al. 1977).

The two main types of distance analysis are Euclidean (isotropic) and cost-weighted (anisotropic). Isotropic distance is a straight-line analysis or ‘as the crow flies’ distance. It is useful for determining the distance from a certain feature or observation point. However, travelling in a straight line and/or avoiding obstacles that may impede straight-line travel are not always optimal. Anisotropic distance modifies isotropic distance by equating distance with a cost factor, thereby providing results that are more realistic. Various surface-costs - slope, aspect, or vegetation type - are summed together to determine a travel cost raster. Each cell is assigned a per-unit-cost of travel. The cost is the cost to travel for one meter within the raster cell. In other words, if the resolution is thirty meters, the cost to travel horizontally or vertically would be the assigned cost
multiplied by the resolution (thirty) and to travel diagonally, the assigned cost would be multiplied by the resolution first and then multiplied by the diagonal factor of $1.414214$ or $\sqrt{2}$. Cost-surface algorithms employ a queen’s or knight’s movement across the raster to generate the new cost-surface. A cost-surface raster represents the actual surface distance rather than the ‘straight line’ (planimetric or Euclidean) distance. When the surface is not flat, travel distance is greater, which means higher costs.

Several environmental and cultural cost-factors, referred to as surface costs, influence travel choices. Environmental costs include topography, hydrology, vegetation, slope, terrain roughness, surface type as well as line of sight/viewsheds and distance to water. Cultural costs include structures, pre-existing roads/paths, borders (political/cultural), site location, spheres of influence, and social distance. These are by no means the only costs that influence travel. Other factors, depending upon the questions being asked, may be utilized as a cost-factor.

Terrain, in the form of a slope raster, is the most employed cost-factor. When considering terrain, a common assumption is that higher slopes result in higher costs to traverse. There are several problems with this assumption. An isotropic algorithm does not consider directionality. Algorithms used in calculating LCA seek out raster cells that represent the least amount of effort;
typically, areas with little to no slope. For example, when moving from a lower slope value to a higher slope value, the algorithm assumes a higher cost than when moving from a higher slope value to a lower slope value. Additionally, travel from point A to point B may not be the same as from point B to point A. In his review of isotropic and anisotropic approaches, John Kantner (2012:229) suggests that archaeologists employ an anisotropic LCA that considers movement from both directions. Further, Kantner suggests that ESRI’s ArcGIS standard cost-surface function can handle anisotropic movement “only if a ‘vertical factor table’ of modifiers for each positive and negative slope degree is provided.”

Additionally, DEM/slope raster resolution is critical. A five-meter resolution offers more variance in low/flat surfaces than a thirty-meter resolution; however, the finer the resolution is, the more detailed data is produced and the processing time is increased. A third drawback to using slope as a cost-factor is that slope is represented as either percent or degrees. Percent and degree produce different outcomes. Despite the drawbacks outlined by Kantner, slope continues to be used as a proxy for movement costs (c.f. White and Surface-Evans 2012).

Incorporating multiple criteria, based on several factors, in least cost analysis models allows for greater flexibility and variation when simulating
decision-making and mobility across the landscape. As previously stated, optimal movement through the landscape does not often occur in a straight line between point A and point B nor does it occur only in an uphill/downhill pattern. There are often other obstacles, such as vegetation, water, and structures, that impede movement. Terrain should not be the only criteria determining movement across the landscape; therefore, other factors must be taken into consideration (c.f. Howey 2007; Whitley et al. 2002). When identifying which multiple criteria to incorporate into LCA, archaeologists must incorporate factors relevant to the research questions being asked.

Multiple criteria factors can be either unweighted or weighted. In an unweighted cost-surface grid, all criteria have equal weight regardless of independent importance. For example, Howey (2007) combined vegetation land cover, waterways, and modified slope as unweighted criteria for her accumulated cost distance. In a weighted cost-surface grid, different criteria, such as slope and aspect, can be assigned a value based upon the amount of influence that criteria carry in the LCA (total must be 100). For example, Whitley (2001a, 2001b) generated fifteen formulas that incorporated various combinations of independent variables, such as wetlands, soils, archaeological sites, and slope, as weighted criteria for his study of pre-historic and historic settlement patterns at the Charleston (SC) Naval Weapons Station.
However, LCA is a relatively new area of inquiry in archaeology (Herzog 2014; White and Surface-Evans 2012). In the last fifty years, archaeologists employed LCA to study embedded social hierarchy in landscapes, social interactions within/through space, and human interaction with the landscape (Llobera 2000; White and Surface-Evans 2012; Whitley and Hicks 2001; van Leusen 2002). In examining ancient societies, prehistoric archaeologists employed LCA to test optimal foraging and site catchment theories. For example, Sarah L. Surface-Evans (2012:128-151) tested the Janzen model (1977) regarding the hunter-gatherers shift from foraging to collector strategies. Heather Richards-Rissetto (2012:109-127) measured social connectivity among Mayan society using configurational analysis to reveal how socio-political hierarchy was embedded in their landscape. Most interesting for the purposes of the East Branch study, Kevin C. Nolan and Robert A. Cook (2012:67-93) developed a model based on cardinal and sub-cardinal catchment theory to identify the most efficient paths from each zone. Nolan and Cook suggest that their model has the potential to identify areas for future survey and/or to evaluate a regional interaction network.

While the employment of LCA appears among several pre-historic archaeological studies, few historical archaeologists have incorporated LCA into their studies. For example, Whitley (2008) created cost-surfaces – distance from the overseer’s house, along the main entrance road, and the road to the rice mill -
to model the location of African American ritual space. In another study, Whitley and Hicks (2003) examined five historical trails in Georgia to test the correlation between Mississippian routes and historical routes.

The work of several scholars influenced the choice of models for examination of the research questions for the East Branch. They include: (1) Richards-Rissetto’s (2012) study that measured social integration; (2) Surface-Evans’s (2012) study that created cost-catchments to simulate ‘areas of influence’; (3) Nolan and Cook’s (2012) study that created cardinal (N, S, E, W) and sub-cardinal (NE, SE, SW, NW) catchment wedges/zones to generate a control for LCA; and (4) Whitley’s (2008) study of risk strategies among enslaved laborers on a Georgia plantation. Whitley’s study of risk strategies among enslaved laborers on Georgia plantations was discussed earlier in this chapter.

Using ESRI ArcGIS 9.1 and ArcGIS Minitab 15, Richards-Rissetto’s model measured the integration or connectivity of the community by using a cost-of-passage function based on friction or impedance. The variables she used were proximity or distance, topography, hydrology, and cultural features. In her study, least cost paths (LCP, a single raster cell wide) indicated the “likelihood that movement … occur[ed] to or through a particular space”; thereby, she could “quantify the degree of connectivity between spaces” and “between different social groups and different parts of cities” (2012:115). While this type of inquiry
is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is a possible method to be considered for future inquiry in historical plantation archaeology.

Surface-Evans also used ArcGIS to create cost corridors (sum of the cost-surface from an origin and the cost-surface from a destination) that “allow[ed] for wandering or deviation from the ‘ideal’ pathway” (2012:132). Her variables included slope, terrain, and hydrology (the Ohio River) but omitted vegetation. Additionally, she converted the cost corridors from a raster into a polygon to examine statistically any inclusive cultural and natural features within the corridors; these polygons became the site-cost catchments. Surface-Evans concluded that, “cost catchments provide[d] a more nuanced picture of accessibility to aspects of a social landscape” (2012:142).

Nolan and Cook used ArcGIS 9.3 to create ‘control’ surfaces to study past human movement. They created circular catchments that were then divided into forty-five-degree wedges representing cardinal and sub-cardinal directions. They performed isotropic LCP analysis for each wedge/zone to “get a general picture of the avenues most likely to be traveled in any direction irrespective of the location of known sites” (2012:75). Accordingly, they suggest this method prevents bias being introduced into the analysis based on “extant distributional knowledge.” Nolan and Cook concluded that the control paths can be used to
“identify areas in need of survey ... and/or to evaluate the nature ... of the site ... in a regional interaction network” (2012:89).

Archaeologists have identified variables that influenced historic settlement patterns in the South Carolina Lowcountry (Drucker and Anthony 1979; Soil Systems, Inc. 1982; South and Hartley 1985; Stine 1991; Stine et al.1993; Tidewater Atlantic Research, Inc. 1995; Whitley 2001; Zierden et al.1986). These variables include: (1) accessibility to navigable waters, (2) suitable well-drained, fertile soils, and (3) proximity to other travel arteries, such as roads and paths. Interior roads often replaced or followed pre-existing Native American trading paths. The distribution of marshes also contributed to the road network pattern; however, in some cases roads followed settlement patterns rather than vice versa (Whitley 2001:22). Therefore, variables such soil, hydrology, and land use are important parameters for mobility models and are incorporated into the LCA.

While most LCA studies, especially in pre-historic archaeology, tend to focus on land-based travel a few archaeologists attempt to model the cost-factor of river-based travel, which may have affected inter-community travel. These archaeologists take into consideration the effect of waterways in producing cost-surface rasters (Howey 2007; Livingood 2012; Nolan and Cook 2012; Surface-Evans 2012). Rivers, creeks, and wetlands are obstacles to land-based travel. In her study of intertribal interaction in Michigan, Howey (2007) included water
criteria to connect pre-dam water features. To test Mississippians’ settlement patterns, Patrick Livingood (2012:174-187) created an anisotropic cost-surface using the size of waterways (measured as cfs) and the direction of current mean annual flows in his study of Mississippian peoples travel over waterways via canoe travel. While Livingood concludes that it is currently impossible to factor in all costs associated with waterways, he suggests that his model creates “a more nuanced understanding of the regional settlement system” (2012:184).

Although river-based travel was important to the residents of the East Branch, the exploration of river-based costs is beyond the scope of this investigation.

The study of the East Branch explored how the planter-elite and the enslaved laborers interacted with the landscape. Directionality and distance, as well as proximity, were important factors. Therefore, models that tested cumulative distance rather than duration/travel time or energetic/caloric output were employed. The study of the East Branch employed LCA to investigate several research questions. First, did the planter-elite experience a degree of social connectivity that differed from the enslaved laborers? Second, did the planter’s built landscape and the natural landscape influence movement of the enslaved laborers? Third, what paths and/or corridors did the enslaved laborers employ that were out of view of the planter-elite’s visual control?
Acquired and Derived Datasets

This section of the chapter presents the datasets for the cognitive predictive model. First, basic data representation is discussed. Next, the various datasets are discussed. Research of various maps, such as the Ferguson and Babson map (Map 5.1; hereinafter Ferguson/Babson will be used when referring to the map), which served as the primary documentation, were incorporated to develop as complete as possible the visual representation of the East Branch and to process the cognitive predictive model. The power of any predictive model depends on the appropriate datasets, spatial extent, and resolution as well as a sound theoretical framework. Datasets include information from geographical, ecological, archaeological, and documentary research in the region. Environmental variables included elevation, hydrology, soil, topography, slope, aspect, etc. For the East Branch study, social variables included land ownership (recreated and discussed in chapter four) which were modeled in the form of VA and LCA.

GIS datasets model the world in either vector or raster format. Vector datasets, more suitable for anthropogenic features, store data that have discrete boundaries, such as plantation boundaries and roads and represent features as points, lines, and polygons. On the other hand, raster datasets that define space in equally-sized cells are better suited for physical and environmental systems
that varies continuously, such as soil type or vegetation class. Vector datasets can be converted or rasterized into cell datasets.

The strength of raster datasets lies in the performance of mathematical calculations with operators and functions, setting up selection queries, or typing Map Algebra syntax. Map Algebra (MA) is a high-level spatial modeling language that defines syntax for combining mathematical, logical or Boolean operators with spatial analysis functions (Wade and Sommer 2006:130). These operations function at three levels: local, focal, and zonal. A local analysis calculates the output of each cell where the output value may be a function of all the cells in the input raster (Wade and Sommer 2006:125). A focal analysis calculates the output value of that cell and the values of cells within a specified neighborhood around the cell (Wade and Sommer 2006:79). A zonal analysis calculates the output values that intersect or fall within each zone of a specified input zone dataset. In zonal analysis, the input dataset is used to define the size, shape and location of each zone. A value raster identifies the values used in the evaluation within the zones (Wade and Sommer 2006:240).

Through preprocessing, images and paper maps were prepared for viewing and analysis, including georeferencing, clipping, positioning, resizing, enhancing, and mosaicking. Paper maps required conversion into vector datasets by ‘heads-up’ digitization. Heads-up digitizing is a method used to vectorize
raster information by manually tracing features on the computer (Wade and Sommer 2006:99). Once maps were digitized, datasets were georeferenced, projected, and joined to adjacent maps. Georeferencing involved aligning vectorized features to a known coordinate system so that the map could be viewed, queried, and analyzed with other geographic data. Projecting involved transforming all data to the same scale (degree of detail or accuracy) either temporarily for display purposes or permanently for analysis. In joining adjacent maps, maximum distortion often occurred at the join but became less distorted further away; however, by applying ESRI’s mosaic function the abrupt edges of multiple overlapping rasters were minimized.

The key for identifying and interpreting spatial patterns is in the management of different layers of data. Therefore, it is crucial that all datasets were projected to the same coordinate system and same reference value. Hence, all historical maps and data were projected (overlaid) projected using South Carolina UTM zone 17N, North American 1927 datum coordinate system. Equally important was map scale, which determined the detail with which location and shape of geographic features were depicted. For example, small areas, such as locations of the plantation house and enslaved laborer settlement centroids were represented as points. The most common scale of the USGS topographic quad map is the 7.5-minute quad or 1:24,000 scale, where one inch
represents two thousand feet (one centimeter equals two hundred forty meters). Near thirty degrees north, a quad contains an area of approximately sixty-four square miles (166 km²); otherwise, a quad covers approximately forty to seventy miles² (one hundred thirty to one hundred eighty km²) (USGS Map Scales Fact Sheet). Due to the amount of detail in these maps, they are excellent for georeferencing raster datasets, especially scanned or digitized paper maps. The East Branch falls within six adjacent USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps: Bethera, Cain Hoy, Cordesville, Huger, Kittredge, and North Charleston. The topographical spatial extent is N 33.25, E -79.75, S 32.125, and W -80.

Derived surface models known as digital elevation models (DEM) represent the Earth’s terrain derived from elevation values. A DEM is a 3D representation of the terrain in a continuous raster format that can be either hypsometric (land elevation) and/or bathymetric (underwater). DEMs were derived from the existing six USGS topographic maps. Since the DEM is the basis for spatial computations and analyses, it is very important that the accuracy of the original data is as high as possible; therefore, cell size is critical. At lower resolutions, data becomes over-generalized and inaccurate; at higher resolutions, data storage becomes a problem. Cell size for the East Branch derived DEM was 30m, the same as the DEM quadrants (Figure 5.2). Layers of raster data were
draped over elevations to provide a representation of the features on the Earth’s surface.

DEM accuracy is important as small errors in elevation affect derived datasets. One approach to test the veracity of a DEM is by incorporating a Monte Carlo simulation, which randomly changes DEM values based on their error. The principle underlying a Monte Carlo approach is that the resulting DEM represents one of an infinite number of possible realizations (Carlisle 2002). After completing the process several times (between fifty and two hundred), a collection of DEM maps can be examined by comparing their histograms. The output is a probable DEM with values ranging from zero to the number of values. The disadvantage of a Monte Carlo simulation lies in the fact that it is computationally demanding. Therefore, error propagation analysis was not performed for this dissertation.

Depicting accurate historical environmental data is often difficult and archaeologists must rely upon modern datasets (Kvamme 1992). Kvamme supports the use of modern environmental variables, which are relatively reliable because the environment remains reasonably, although no universally, stable over a period of fifteen thousand years, even though landscapes change. In the East Branch, a pattern of land use over the past four centuries has resulted in a relatively stable environment. In the twentieth century, lumber companies
and/or the Francis Marion National Forest managed much of the land, which has never been extensively plowed. One area of documented intrusion occurred in late 1977 and early 1978 for the location of the East Cooper and Berkeley Railroad construction on Limerick Plantation (c.f. Lees 1980).

Environmental data used for this dissertation were obtained from the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) GIS database. Topographically, the East Branch remains much the same today as it did historically. Historically, the uplands were used for pasture and agriculture; following the Civil War, the land slowly returned to forest (Ferguson and Babson 1986:11). The lowlands are characterized by the massive hydrological system of the rice production. This water system consists of borrow pits, canals, causeways, dams, dikes, ditches, and embankments along the river, creeks, branch, and swamps. The remnants of this hydrological system are very visible on modern maps and remote images. Therefore, DEM and hydrography dataset reflect historical environmental variables that remain intact in modern times.

Wetland data was extracted from the six quad USEPA Wetlands (land use/land cover) dataset. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) defines wetlands as areas where water covers the soil or is present either at or near the surface of the soil all year or for varying periods during the
year, including during the growing season. The various representations of the wetland data are presented in Figure 5.3.

A representation of wetland travel costs can be calculated by combining wetland areas with the degree of slope. There are two types of classification systems for wetlands. The Cowardin System, used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI), includes five major wetland types: marine, tidal, lacustrine, palustrine and riverine. The Brinson System, used by the USACE, includes five major wetland geomorphic types: riverine, slope, depressional, flat and fringe.

Vegetation can be gleaned from extant late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century plats, which included areas labeled as old fields, old rice fields, cornfields, pines, hardwoods, etc. However, reconstructing historic vegetation is difficult because archaeologists can never know with certainty the exact location of specific trees and/or vegetation. At best, archaeologists can only reconstruct vegetation in broad terms for a particular point in time.

Two scholars have offered models for including vegetation into viewshed modeling (Domingo-Santos et al. 2011; Llobera 2007). Marcos Llobera (2007:799-810) argued that viewsheds could be enhanced with the inclusion of vegetation since density exponentially decreased visibility across the landscape. Llobera’s proposed model and algorithm required a 3D model of tree/plant as well as a
layer indicating the spatial distribution and density of vegetation. Llobera’s model was based on the reconstruction of a single tree type. While theoretically sound, Llobera’s vegetation algorithm has yet to be empirically tested. Domingo-Santos et al. (2011) offered an option that created a vegetation elevation model, which was added to the DEM. Their vegetation model rasterized vector vegetation heights and corrected the DEM to include these calculations. Not only did the Domingo-Santos’s model rely upon modern data, their model did not account for vegetation type, distribution, or density. The output of the vegetation model assumed that high density existed to prevent visibility (Domingo-Santos et al. 2011; Hernández 2003). The main problem with either of these approaches is that not enough documentation exists to recreate archaeological landscapes that represent historic tree/plant densities and distributions. Incorporating historic vegetation cover presents a challenge; therefore, vegetation was considered as a cost variable in the East Branch study.

Soils types influence land use and settlement patterns; therefore, interpretation can provide quantitative and qualitative information for predictive modeling. Soil behavior determines whether an area is suitable for certain activities. Whitley (2001) and John Cable (1996) found a high interdependence between site location and soil types. For example, loamy texture soils are best for farmland. Because plantations were primarily agricultural endeavors, it follows
that loamy soils likely correlated with seed/grain fertility values. In another example from a study in West Virginia and Virginia, Lock and Harris (2006) used soil type as an environmental parameter to determine that archaeological sites near water were also found near fertile, silty-loam textured soils. They concluded that fertile vegetation, such as forested areas, were more appealing than barren or wetland areas for settlement. In the East Branch study area, clayey soils along the marsh were used for rice production while loamy upland soils were used for growing crops and for pasturing livestock (Ferguson and Babson 1986:4; Lees 1980:23-29; Terry 1981:16-81; Widmer 1976:7-12).

Soil scientists group soils into series based upon origin, color, and other general characteristics. As discussed in chapter two, soils fell into one of three broad textural classes: (1) Sandy soil material: coarse textured; (2) Loamy soil materials: moderately coarse-textured, medium-textured, moderately fine-textured; or (3) Clayey soils: fine-textured. As shown in figure 5.4, the broad classes were subdivided into six subclasses: (1) Sands (coarse sand, sand, fine sand, very fine sand); (2) Loamy sands (loamy coarse sand, loamy sand, loamy fine sand, loamy very fine sand); (3) Coarse sandy loam, sandy loam, fine sandy loam; (4) Very fine sandy loam, loam, silt loam, silt; (5) Clay loam, sandy clay loam, silty clay loam; and (6) Sandy clay, silty clay, clay.
As soil science became more sophisticated and refined, Latimer’s soil series were expanded and revised. In the East Branch study area, approximately thirty different soil series are identified in the modern dataset, including borrow pits (BP), water (W), non-specific aquatic udifluvents (Au), and non-specific udorthents (UD). The dataset includes soils associated with Bethera (Be), Bohicket (BH), Capers (CP), and Chipley-Echaw (Ct) series. Only the Norfolk (No) series name continues from Lattimer’s 1918 report. The pertinent soil series, texture, and slope are listed in table 5.1. The percentage slope indicates the topographical location of the series. The percent of six quads represents the amount of each series within the six topographic quads. Because other series are present in the topographic area but not present in the study area, the total does not equal one hundred percent.

As outlined in chapter two, the 1916 soil series map (Latimer et al., 1918) was more temporally proximate to the study period; however, the low resolution of the downloaded TIFF image from the University of South Carolina Map Division was inappropriate for heads up digitizing. Therefore, modern soil series data for the six USGS quads were acquired from the SCDNR GIS database (figure 5.5).

Two important soil attributes for studying mobility are soil texture and drainage, which are interrelated. The strength of soil changes with water content.
Sand promotes rapid movement of water, silt promotes slow movement of water, and clay promotes very slow movement of water. Soils with higher drainage, such as clay, have less trafficability. Another factor, stickiness, impedes trafficability in very wet but not saturated soils, such as clay. Soils in subtropical areas, such as the Lowcountry, tend to have higher moisture content. Another factor to consider is that when a water table is within four feet of the surface, it most likely will contribute to much wetter soils; these soils tend to be gray or blue mottled. Based upon drainage, the soil dataset was reclassified as a criterion in terms of trafficability for least cost analysis (q.v. chapter seven). Trafficability is the “ability of soil to support weight of humans, animals, and machines for moving about on the soil” (Fausey 2006:495). The lower the number value, the higher the probability of mobility and a positive relationship with archaeological deposits.

In addition to acquired datasets, two important derived raster datasets were created from the elevation DEM. The Slope Tool in ArcMap 10.5.1 was used to determine the slope, the incline or steepness of a surface, based on slope percent. The Aspect Tool in ArcMap 10.5.1 was used to determine aspect, the compass direction that topographic slope faces. The Colormap Function allowed a specified color to represent the downward compass direction of the slope
(figure 5.6). Both datasets were necessary for the viewshed/visibility analyses and the LCA cost-surfaces.

In 1986, Leland Ferguson and David Babson created a composite cartographic representation of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century East Branch drawn from old plats, plans, maps, and United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps. The Ferguson/Babson map has been the source of several archaeological studies involving enslaved laborer quarter location, underwater archaeology, cultural resource plans, environmental history, and GIS statistical analysis (Barnes and Steen 2012; Ferguson 2016; Mather and Watts 1998; New South Associates 2004; Randle 2011; Smith 2012; USDOI 2003).

The Ferguson/Babson composite map represented a cartographic baseline for the East Branch between 1785 and 1820. Ferguson and Babson recovered fourteen maps/plats that covered nineteen plantations (table 5.2). Under the guidance of Ferguson, Babson transferred each map/plat to an enlarged (1.5 times) copy of the USGS quads of the study area. Most of the maps/plats correlated well with the modern physical and cultural features (buildings, roads, fields, fences, dikes, and canals) on the quads (1986:16). However, Babson encountered errors, such as poor condition of plats, redrawn boundaries, and poor join in the enlargement, to name a few (1986:41-77). Therefore, as a compromise, Babson ‘eyeballed’ some boundaries and watercourses for a ‘best
As with other data, these compromises must be considered when interpreting the results and drawing conclusions about the accuracy of the analysis employed.

Upon close examination of the Ferguson/Babson map, an error revealed the Hut Plantation as part of Fishpond Plantation. As revealed in chapter four, the Harleston family owned both properties. Perhaps, the surveyor created the plat before the plantations were separated or aggregated the two plantations into one for the plat. This error highlights the necessity for archaeologists and historians to examine peripheral properties not only through extant maps but also through landownership records.

One of the objectives of this dissertation was to locate plats for the unrecorded areas on the Ferguson/Babson map (Table 5.3). These plats were digitized and georeferenced to Google Earth Pro to establish their locations in the real world. Metes and bounds descriptions were not referenced in the mapping process; however, tracing ownership was important to understanding the historical setting and development of the East Branch community. As with the Ferguson/Babson map, accuracy problems were introduced when aligning the various maps together. Decisions regarding ‘best fit’ were made to account for distortions, enlargement errors, missing/misaligned cultural features, and natural changes in watercourses.
Archival research for plats required investigating plats created on either side of the East Branch study’s temporal limits (1780-1822). Combined with the knowledge of property ownership beginning with grants from the Lords Proprietors in the late 1600s to approximately the mid-nineteenth century aided in the location of some plats. Several plats were located in the collection of H.A.M. Smith at the South Carolina Historical Society. In his meticulous research of early South Carolina history, Smith sketched copies of early plats that may no longer be extant. Not all plat found were of equal quality. Some plats were more detailed than others and some were just outlines of the property. Yet, each plat provided information that either corroborated other information or provided new information.

An important sketch made by Smith was the thirty-five hundred acres of Cypress Barony conveyed to Michael Mahon by Landgrave Thomas Colleton. Smith indicated that his sketch is a copy of the plat of Cypress Barony as laid out by James Child in 1709 (map 5.2). Mahon’s lands were bounded by Gough’s lands (portion of Cypress Barony), Quash, Elias Ball, Dominick Arthur, Reverend Thomas Hasell, John Nicholson, and “lands not laid out.”

Another plat (map 5.3) sketched by H.A.M. Smith of the 1709 plat of Cypress Barony was modified to reveal the subsequent plantations (highlighted in red boxes) and the division of the Barony (green dashed lines).
In 1906, Simons and Mayrant Company created a very detailed plat of Cherry and Cedar Hill Plantations (shared border shown by green line). This plat, shown as map 5.4, included locations of a brickyard, causeways, roads (as is and altered), old cornfield, old tar kiln, and embankments. Additionally, the plat included a house on a promontory labeled “Cherry Hill House” as well as an “old settlement” in an “old field” (red arrows). Details included the locations of Cainhoy Road, Smooky [sic] Hall Road, and lands bounded by Thomas Deerington [sic] and Mr. Brindley. Recall from chapter four that Deerington and Brindley were owners of Spring Hill Plantation.

In 1773, Joseph Purcell surveyed Fishbrook Plantation for Robert Quash (map 5.5). Fishbrook was bounded by Windsor, which belonged earlier to Ebenezer Roche, John Ball, the East Branch of Cooper River, Gabriel Manigault, and Isaac Harleston. The plat indicated that a house and settlement (red arrow) existed at Fishbrook.

Although Irishtown (aka Irish Town) Plantation, a 10,593-acre inland plantation in St. James Parish, did not front on the East Branch, it was, nevertheless, an integral part of the East Branch community. Several plats were located that provide knowledge of the built and cultural landscape (maps 5.5-5.7, inclusive). In 1700, Joseph Purcell created a very detailed plat for Andrew Hasell. Irishtown was later divided and resurveyed for the Estate of William Harleston.
who left the property to his siblings. Plats dated 1834 were located for two of the three divided lots. Irishtown lot 1 indicated a house on a road at Turkey Creek and was bounded by the Estate of D.J. Waring, Silk Hope, and lots 2 and 3. Irishtown lot 2 indicated a settlement with cultivated fields among a mostly uncultivated tract. Lot 2 was bounded by lot 1, Silk Hope, Brickyard, and the Estate of Andrew Hasell. Irishtown Plantation is represented in the next three images. The red arrows indicate the locations of settlements/buildings. The corresponding settlements on the 1834 division maps of Lots 1 and 2 (shown on left) and the settlements on the earlier 1700 map (shown on right) are circled in blue.

A plat dated c. 1810 from the Smith collection that indicated neither the property owner or name of the plantation (map 5.8). The plat appears to be Jericho Plantation because it was bounded by John Coming Ball, Limerick belonging to Elias Ball, and Windsor belonging to Major Edwards. There is no indication of a settlement on the property; however, just outside the western boundary is a building identified as “Henderson House” and outside the eastern boundary is a settlement. In the middle of the lot is an unnamed building of some unknown type. All buildings are indicated by the red arrows.

An 1810 plat of Silk Hope indicated a house near the river and several roads (map 5.9). Silk Hope was bounded by Quash, a creek (Quinby creek),
Shubrick, John Ashby, Hasell, Thomas Ashby, and Isaac Harleston. Although both the Manigaults and Heywards were large slave owners, the only building shown is the main house indicated below at the red arrow.

Another interesting plat in the Smith Collection is that of Spring Hill Plantation shown as map 5.10. The plat is clearly of Spring Hill yet was mislabeled as Springfield Plantation. Smith indicated that the date of the original plat is unknown; however, Smith dated it to possibly 1878-1880 based upon the property owner, W.P. Ingraham. The plantation was bounded by John Huger and Cherry Hill. Most interestingly, the plat indicated that another bordering plantation, Benevento was owned by B.G. Lucas. As was discussed in chapter four, the only known location for Benevento was as formerly a portion of Hagan Plantation as label on another plat. Finding this plat, indicates that additional landownership research beyond the temporal period of this study may reveal additional plats.

The 1790 plat of Windsor Plantation (map 5.11) did not identify the property owner, however, it was bounded by Elias Ball (Limerick Plantation), Robert Quash, and Andrew Hasell. The Windsor plat indicated the location of a house and settlement on a promontory (red arrow).

A review of Joseph P. Gaillard’s composite map (SCHS Gaillard Map Collection) that documented the location of plantations in Berkeley and parts of
Charleston and Dorchester counties, was beneficial in locating and verifying several plantations, especially those that did not border the East Branch. Additionally, Gaillard’s map was beneficial in determining the spatial extent of the study area. A polygon was created of the relevant plantations in Google Earth Pro to create a georeferenced polygon outline of the study area. A perfect match did not occur because the original scanned paper map experienced some warping and distortion in the copying process. Best choice alignments were made to the junction of highways 402 and 41 and to bends in the Cooper River. Using the Google Earth measurement tool alignment errors could be as much as 455.77 meters, which requires that GPS ground truthing should be performed in the future before any excavations are undertaken. The resultant KML was imported into ArcMap and converted to a shapefile with a free online KML tool (www.zonums.com/online/kml2shp.php). The shapefile was transformed on the fly from WGS84 to UTM 17N. The resulting spatial extent for the study area was -79.937005, 32.999224, -79.7546591, 33.174922. The study area perimeter measured 85.9 km and the area measured 172 km² or 17,170 hectares/42,427 acres.

All vector layers, such as hydrography, wetlands, soils, etc., were converted from vector polygons to raster format. The raster layers were snapped to the DEM layer thereby insuring the 30-meter resolution, spatial extent, and
coordinate system. Each vector raster was clipped to cover only the area within the study area.

**Conclusion**

In this dissertation, I add to the work of Ferguson and Babson (1986:7) who determined that the layout of plantation settlements was a product of several criteria: (1) intended use, (2) physical landscape, (3) building materials, and (4) the planter-elite’s idea of how a group of buildings should look. Specifically, this dissertation expands upon their study by incorporating GIS to evaluate and to interpret how the planter-elite’s perceived ideology of surveillance and control influenced the enslaved laborers’ perceptions as they moved through and interacted with the prescribed physical and cultural landscape.

I briefly cover the history of predictive modeling and its place within CRM and academic archaeology. As a heuristic tool, modeling has the capability of assisting historical archaeologists in locating *probable* areas of activity for future surveying and excavating. With a renewed interest in human behavior, the field of historical archaeology has witnessed a growth in studies that focus on human perception of the landscape. Whether GIS is part of the historical archaeologist’s toolkit or practice, it offers the opportunity to model, test, and
interpret perception and cognition hypotheses regarding settlement patterns and mobility through the landscape.

The methodological approach chosen for the cognitive predict model was driven by several research questions. First, how did the planter-elite arrange their plantations, given the physical landscape, to re-enforce their ideology of surveillance and control? This question was approached through the creation of viewsheds and intervisibility analyses. Several viewshed analyses were explored to examine the probabilities that visibility re-enforced the planter-elites’ perceived notions of landscape as a mechanism for surveillance and control over their enslaved population. The results of the analyses are discussed in chapter six.

The second research question is from the viewpoint of the enslaved laborers. If the planter-elite believed they had control over their landscape, then how did the enslaved laborers move through this perceived landscape? This question was addressed through least cost analysis. Various least cost analyses are explored to locate probable paths, corridors, or networks that the enslaved laborers may have used to move through the ‘actual and perceived’ landscape. The results are discussed in chapter seven.

For the East Branch study, two analyses - visibility and least cost - were selected to model perception and cognition of the planter-elite and enslaved
laborer landscapes. While visibility studies have a long history in prehistorical archaeological research, least cost analysis studies have recently come to the attention of historical archaeologists. Combining these two analytical methodologies permits a fuller understanding of how past societies interacted with and moved through their physical and cultural landscape. It is important to remember that these methods only present *probable* locations, follow-up field survey is required to refine and to test the validity of the models.
Table 5.1 East Branch Soil Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Series</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>% Slope</th>
<th>% of Six Quads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayboro (BA)</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethera (Be)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneau (BoA, BoB)</td>
<td>loamy sand</td>
<td>0 - 2, 2 - 6</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainhoy (CoB)</td>
<td>fine sand</td>
<td>0 – 6</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline (CoA, CoB)</td>
<td>fine sandy loam</td>
<td>0 - 2, 2 - 6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven (CvA, CvB)</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>0 - 2, 2 - 6</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplin (DuA, DuB)</td>
<td>fine sandy loam</td>
<td>0 - 2, 2 - 6</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsboro (GoA)</td>
<td>loamy sand</td>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenoir (Le)</td>
<td>fine sandy loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon (Lo)</td>
<td>fine sand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy (LuB)</td>
<td>loamy sand</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg (Ly)</td>
<td>fine sandy loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggett (Mg)</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggett (Mp)</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk (NoA, NoB)</td>
<td>loamy sand</td>
<td>0 - 2, 2 - 6</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocilla (Oc)</td>
<td>loamy fine sand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamlico (Pa)</td>
<td>Muck</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantego (Pe)</td>
<td>fine sandy loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickney (Pk)</td>
<td>loamy fine sand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rains (Ra)</td>
<td>fine sandy loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee (Sa)</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahee (Wa)</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witherbee (Wt)</td>
<td>fine sand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantations</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cartographer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hagan</td>
<td>John Huger</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akinfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[copy with Spring Hill included]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Before 1925</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagan</td>
<td>Daniel Huger &amp; Benjamin Huger</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Jacobsen (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill</td>
<td>Thomas Dearington</td>
<td>Before 1825</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessing</td>
<td>John Deas</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Vere</td>
<td>Benjamin Simons</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleburg</td>
<td>Benjamin Simons</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinby</td>
<td>Thomas Shubrick</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>Elias Ball</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>Elias Ball</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>John Hardwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Kensington</td>
<td>John Ball</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James So-Boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>John Ball</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Farmfield Boss’s</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1785 – 1790</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Pond</td>
<td>William &amp; Edward Harleston</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3 New Plats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantations</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cartographer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simons &amp; Mayrant Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>James Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Barony</td>
<td>Michael Mahon</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(portion)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbrook</td>
<td>Robert Quash</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>R.Q. Pinckney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Town</td>
<td>Andrew Hasell</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>R.Q. Pinckney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Town, Lot 1</td>
<td>Edward Harleston</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>R.Q. Pinckney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Town, Lot 2</td>
<td>Heirs of William</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>R.Q. Pinckney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harleston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c. 1810</td>
<td>Smith Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Hope</td>
<td>(Manigault)</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Smith Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springhill</td>
<td>W.P. Ingraham</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Smith Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Springfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1878-1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Thomas Greene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.1. An outline of the cognitive predictive model approach (based on Whitley 2005; Verhagen and Whitley 2012:72).
Figure 5.1 The Ferguson/Babson 1986 Map of the East Branch of the Cooper River (copy in possession of author).
Figure 5.2 Digital Elevation
Figure 5.3 Wetlands: National Wetlands Inventory (left), South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
Figure 5.4 Soil Classification Chart
Figure 5.5 Soil Series
Figure 5.6 Slope and Aspect
Map 5.1 Plat of 3500 acres of Cypress Barony conveyed to Michael Mahon by Landgrave Thomas Colleton sketched by H.A.M. Smith (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.2 1709 Plat of Cypress Barony sketched by H.A.M. Smith (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.3 Plat of Cherry & Cedar Hill by Simons and Mayrant Co. (Courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.4 Plat of Fishbrook Plantation (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.6 Plat of a portion of Irishtown Plantation (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.7 Plat of a portion of Irishtown Plantation (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.8 Plat of a portion of Irishtown Plantation (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.9 Plat of Jericho Plantation (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.10 Plat of a portion of Silk Hope Plantation (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.11 Sketch of Spring Hill Plantation by H.A.M. Smith mislabeled as Springfield Plantation (courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society).
Map 5.12 Plat of Windsor Plantation (courtesy of Hayden Smith).
CHAPTER SIX
PANOPTICISM AND VISIBILITY

In recent years the study of surveillance and control has become a significant framework for addressing issues of power and resistance (Ball et al. 2012). The most influential theory has been the ‘panoptic’ surveillance as argued by French philosopher Michel Foucault (1977). Foucault developed his panopticon theory from the writings and letters of Jeremy Bentham who invoked the concept as a proposed prison design. Foucault’s interpretation of Bentham’s design became the centerpiece for his theory of power – panopticism – a mode of “seeing without being seen” (1977:43). Central to the Foucauldian model of surveillance is the idea of ‘the likelihood of being watched’. In recent years, historical archaeologists have been incorporating geographical theories along with Foucault’s theory to examine site placement, cognition, and control (c.f. Bates et al. 2016; Delle 2016; Randle 2011).

Plantations were complex places consisting of fields, pastures, gardens, work spaces, and numerous buildings (Vlach 1993). Most plantations were most often designed in such a way that activity centered on the main house with enslaved laborer cabins fronting a ‘street’ leading up to it. Often these dwellings
were surrounded by outbuildings that housed the cooper, blacksmith, tanner, commissary, smokehouse, and kitchen. Larger plantations contained barns, stables, sheds, storehouses, and production machinery as well as a kitchen, well, dairy, ice house, smokehouse, laundry, and quarters for house servants near the big house. At some plantations, enslaved laborers who worked in the fields either lived near the fields or in an isolated village.

Plantation layouts suggest the planter-elites designed the location of structures to maximize production and surveillance. Therefore, surveillance and control on plantations was always about the ‘practice’ of control and the materiality of plantation structures and plantation life (Souza and Souza 2016:147-173). Here the term ‘practice’ refers to Bourdieu’s (1977) habitus, wherein he argued that an individual’s position in the social structure resulted from the everyday habits of individuals. Within this social landscape East Branch planter-elites developed strategies for success that relied not only upon intragenerational kinship ties and their larger family network but also upon surveillance and control of the enslaved laborers.

In the study of the East Branch, the panoptic plantation model was applied at the regional scale because, as revealed through landownership research, the East Branch operated as a tight knit kin-based community. The purpose of this chapter is to examine how the panoptic plantation model may
have manifested itself at a larger scale – the community or neighborhood - when nearby planter-elites incorporated overlapping panoptic views within their architecture and/or layout designs. By examining several plantations at the regional scale, both internal and cross-site observations become apparent. The implication of these observations is that despite the planter-elite’s intentional manipulation of the landscape, the enslaved laborers may have modified their movements and activities to circumvent the perceived planter-elite’s cognitive landscape originating from multiple points of observation.

This chapter briefly discusses the Foucauldian (sometimes written as Foucaultian) theoretical approach to plantation archaeology within the framework of surveillance and control – the panopticon. Next, a model of the cognitive landscape of the East Branch community is presented through several Visual Analyses (VA). First, two line-of-sight viewsheds and Cumulative Viewshed Analyses (CVA) of the entire East Branch are presented. Next, line-of-sight viewsheds of grouped plantations (as grouped in chapter four) are presented. Finally, buffers with distance parameters were created to examine the neighbor-assisted surveillance and social control of the planter-elite, the enslaved laborer settlements, and the total East Branch community. The term social interaction in this chapter refers to the sphere of potential interaction, based upon distance variables, that members of each group may have with
surrounding groups. The term neighbor-assisted surveillance refers to the sphere of potential planter-elite surveillance over enslaved laborers in areas of overlapping spheres of surveillance.

The results and interpretations of the models assess the panoptic plantation model theory and proposed probable areas of planter-elite neighbor-assisted surveillance and enslaved laborer social interaction, individually and combined. Potentially these visibility models provide historical archeologists with a method for identifying areas of possible surveillance and control, as well as areas of interaction, surveillance, and control, for future archaeological survey.

**Panoptic Plantation Theory**

French philosopher Michel Foucault invoked the Panopticon in his *Discipline and Punish* (1975, 1977 in English) as a metaphor for modern ‘disciplinary’ societies. Foucault proposed that institutions, such as the army, schools, hospitals, and factories, resembled Bentham's Panopticon, which was a prison designed in such a manner that a central observation tower was surrounded by cells in which the occupant was unable to communicate with his neighbor but also the occupant was unaware of when observations from the tower were occurring. Further, Foucault surmised that the occupants would internalize the rules and self-surveil themselves to prevent punishment, and ultimately, participate in their own surveillance. Compliance did not always
equate to acceptance, however. For example, in their study of enslaved laborers at Groot Walling, a nutmeg plantation on Bandas Besar, Indonesia, Carlson and Jordan (2014:220) suggested that enslaved laborers may have feigned compliance “to develop their own means of identity building and communication means that [were] immune to or at least more difficult to discern through surveillance.”

The prevailing panoptic plantation approach in historical archaeology is based on the theory that the planter-elite designed their plantations to fit the Georgian model, which symbolized the wealth of the elite via architecture, landscaping, and vista. Further, the employment of such designs created the means for planter-elites to engage in specific visual surveillance methods to monitor and modify the behavior of their enslaved laborers.

Building upon Foucault and landscape archaeology approaches, historical archaeologists have examined how existing power relationships influenced how individuals perceived their landscape (Armstrong and Kelly 2000; Bates 2007; Delle 1998, 1999, 2002; Epperson 1999; Leone et al. 2005; Randle 2011; Singleton 2001; Whitley 2002). For instance, Epperson (1999) argued that designing spaces to “make things seeable” while also producing “spaces of constructed invisibility” to monitor slaves’ behavior and conceal their presence was a primary motive for planter-elites. Despite the ‘presumed’ spatial control of plantation space, the planter-elite did not exert total control over their enslaved
laborers. African and African-American laborers could move through the planter-elite’s cognitive landscape in a way that either neutralized or offset the visual effects of the panoptic plantation. Areas of mobility are discussed in chapter seven.

A few caveats should be mentioned before proceeding to the analyses. It was necessary to generalize several areas of the landscape. First, structures were categorized as either planter-elite houses or enslaved laborer settlements. In this manner eighteen planter-elite houses and twenty-one enslaved laborer settlements were identified. Although archival records indicated that several members of the East Branch community employed overseers, the exact locations of overseer residences were not identified or distinguished on the extant plats. Therefore, it was possible that overseers could have resided among the enslaved laborers or near the home of the planter-elites. If that were the case, a modification of the model would be necessary. Second, plat cartography often employed a square/rectangular symbol to indicate the location of buildings. Therefore, precise factors, such as building height, size, and orientation, could not be determined with any degree of accuracy. These areas were further generalized as points representing the central location of a collection of buildings. Future investigations and VA models should include more accurate descriptions and measurements of all structures because knowing the precise
location, dimensions, and layout of these structures would alter intervisibility as some areas appeared visible that were in reality not visible or vice versa. Another factor affecting intervisibility involved the unknown location of various plantation houses and enslaved settlements on plantations without known or extant records. It is recommended that in the future archaeologists continue archival research to locate these plats.

**Visibility Analysis**

The next section explores several aspects of visibility and neighbor-assisted surveillance in the East Branch community. The VA models employed single line-of-sight viewshed and Cumulative Viewshed Analysis (CVA). Viewsheds were useful for determining how visible locations on the landscape were from a specific vantage point. From several observation points, the viewsheds determined what observers might have seen from each location. These viewsheds were performed without considering visual limitations, such as distance, obstructions, or visual acuity. Therefore, the resulting maps display areas of hypothetical visibility (shown in pink) that may not exist in reality. Observer points were created in two separate point shapefiles at the known centroid of each planter-elite house and each enslaved laborer settlement, respectively. The height of the average observer was specified as 1.5 meters. The viewshed identified areas that could be seen from one or more of the observation
points. Analyses of viewsheds at the regional scale (the neighborhood) were followed by analyses of the viewsheds at a smaller scale - grouped plantations as identified in chapter four.

Cumulative Viewshed Analyses (CVA) were created for more robust and detailed interpretations. Unlike the line-of-sight viewshed, CVA returned a value, which indicated the intensity of visibility at a particular cell. Employing CVA permits historical archaeologists to probe deeper into several theoretical questions. For example, CVA allows historical archaeologists to inquire about the degree or intensity of the planter-elite’s visual control over the landscape. Alternatively, CVA provided information about the visual intensity from the viewpoint of the enslaved laborers within this planter-elite controlled landscape. First, a CVA was created from the viewpoint of the planter-elite houses (labeled A in the figures). Next, another CVA was created from the viewpoint of the enslaved settlements (labeled B in the figures). A third CVA was created that combined and compared the two groups.

In the final section, the levels of neighbor-assisted surveillance and social control of the two communities were examined. By employing Tadahiko Higuchi’s (1983) distance parameters, buffers were created to examine the possible neighbor-assisted surveillance of the planter-elite houses and the
enslaved laborer settlements, respectively. Then the two buffer models were examined to assess the social control of the East Branch community.

**East Branch Viewsheds**

Before creating the various viewsheds, a river corridor was created to ascertain the ‘natural’ visibility of the East Branch community from the river. The corridor was determined as the minimum area that could accommodate the river geometry based on a lateral area around the river that considered slope and visibility. Because the planter-elite settled along the river, the centerline of the East Branch of Cooper River was used to represent an observer on the river. The height of the observer was set at 1.5 meters to represent a person standing on the deck of a flat boat. The purpose of this river corridor was to establish a ‘control’ viewshed to investigate whether the landscape alone or in combination with house siting created controlling viewsheds from the East Branch. Additionally, the corridor presented implications affecting mobility, which are discussed in chapter seven.

Using Google Earth Pro, a KML point file was digitized along the centerline of the East Branch from the point where the East Branch diverged from Cooper River at the ‘T’, then along the historic navigable length of the East Branch for twelve miles to its termination just beyond the present-day location of Huger Bridge (shown in red on the maps). Using an online tool, the KML point
file was converted to a polyline shapefile (www.zonums.com/online/kml2shp.php). The new shapefile was imported into ArcMap 10.5.1 and converted from a vector format to a raster format file. A line-of-sight viewshed was created from the centerline of the river that encompassed any cells visible from any point along that centerline (figure 6.1A shown in pink). Next, the binary raster map was converted to vector format. All polygons that were adjacent to each other were dissolved into one polygon. By dissolving only adjacent polygons, any visible areas not along the river were eliminated and resulted in the river corridor polygon (figure 6.1B).

Ten (fifty-five percent) of the eighteen planter-elite houses identified appeared along or within the viewshed of the East Branch. The ten included Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, Silk Hope, Bossis, Middleburg, Richmond, Camp Vere, Blessing, and Hagan Plantations. The river line-of-sight viewshed strongly supported the statement that planter-elites preferred “to make [their] settlements near the rivers, streams and canals …” (Bates and Leland (2015:10, 372).

Seven planter-elite houses did not front on the East Branch or were oriented towards the Cooper River. Akinfield and Moreland Plantations, outside the corridor, were oriented towards the Cooper River south of the ‘T’ where the Cooper River split into the East Branch and West Branch. Although located on
the East Branch, Comingtee Plantation appeared to be oriented towards the West Branch and Fishpond Plantation was located just beyond the river corridor boundary. Spring Hill Plantation was oriented southeast of French Quarter Creek. Inland plantations without direct access to the rivers included Windsor and Smokey Hill Plantations.

The location of the planter-elite houses within the river viewshed suggested that they had a commanding visual control of movement on the river from the ‘T’ to Huger Bridge. Any member of the planter-elite class could easily surveil the comings and goings of boats and other riverine activity. Enslaved laborers would have been aware of this potential visual control. Thus, this river corridor could have significant impact upon the mobility of the enslaved laborers.

A reclassification of the line-of-sight viewshed from binary to natural break count values provided a different analysis. The count values presented the degree of visibility based upon how many cells were visible from the centerline of the river (figure 6.2). Using natural breaks, visibility was reclassified into four categories for comparative visibility. Areas in green represented very low visibility (less than 25%). Yellow represented areas of moderately low visibility (26% – 40%). Orange represented areas of moderately high visibility (41% – 60%). Red represented areas of very high visibility (higher than 60%).
The vast majority of the river corridor fell within the levels of very low to moderately low intervisibility (figure 6.2). Very high levels of visibility (shown in red) occurred from Bossis to Limerick Plantations, primarily concentrated along Kensington Plantation.

Two line-of-sight viewsheds, with an overlay outline of the river corridor, were performed, one from the viewpoint of the planter-elite houses (figure 6.3A) and other from the viewpoint of the enslaved laborer settlements (figure 6.3B). The viewsheds revealed both similarities and differences. The viewsheds from the planter-elite houses and from the enslaved laborer settlements revealed an area of high visibility within the boundaries of the river corridor. This viewshed strongly suggested that a majority of planter-elites may have situated their houses to capture a view of the East Branch and that many of the enslaved laborer settlements were situated in close proximity to the planter-elite houses. However, the enslaved laborer settlement viewshed lacked visibility within a portion of the river corridor between Camp Vere and Middleburg Plantations. This suggested that although the planter-elite houses at these plantations were situated with a line-of-sight view of the East Branch, their associated enslaved laborer settlements were not situated with a line-of-sight towards the river.

When comparing the two viewsheds, almost identical line-of-sight viewsheds from Comingtee, Hagan, Akinfield, and Moreland Plantations
resulted in a southwest orientation towards the Cooper River rather towards the East Branch. In this area, the planter-elite views incorporated land between Akinfield and Spring Hill Plantations that was not shared by the enslaved laborer settlement viewsheds.

Differences occurred at two inland plantations. Views from Windsor (with an enslaved laborer settlement) and Smokey Hill (without an enslaved laborer settlement) Plantations were not oriented towards either the East Branch or the Cooper River. Specifically, both line-of-sight viewsheds at Windsor Plantation were identical, indicating a shared geography by the planter-elite and the enslaved laborers. At Smokey Hill Plantation, the planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed indicated potential visibility surrounding the planter-elite house; however, without an enslaved laborer settlement there was virtually no potential visibility from any neighboring enslaved laborer settlements.

Another difference occurred at the remote inland enslaved laborer settlements north of the East Branch. The planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed appeared to indicate potential visibility; however, the location of these settlements were more than one thousand meters from the planter-elite houses, thereby reducing the potential of actual visibility. Elevation increased as one moved further inland from the river and higher elevations potentially provided
increased visibility from the enslaved laborer settlements in this area. Therefore, topography most likely accounted for the implied potential visibility.

A CVA provided a more robust interpretation of the viewshed from the planter-elite houses (figure 6.4A). In this case, the CVA returned values of between one (green) to twelve (red) indicating low to high intervisibility; the higher the value, the higher intervisibility. The planter-elite house CVA fell between one (green) and five (greenish yellow). The threshold value was five (1.88%) of the total cells; values above five were negligible (less than 1%) (table 6.2).

As with the planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed, the planter-elite CVA suggested intervisibility along the East Branch, within the river corridor, and some intervisibility oriented towards the Cooper River (figure 6.4A). The areas of highest intervisibility occurred within the river corridor from Hagan to Camp Vere Plantations located on the south of the East Branch centerline and between Richmond and Middleburg Plantations located opposite each other at the midpoint length of the East Branch.

The planter-elite CVA results contradicted the East Branch river VA (compare figures 6.2A and 6.4A). While the river CVA suggested high intervisibility between Bossis and Limerick Plantations, with the highest visibility at Kensington Plantation, the planter-elite CVA suggested a significant
shift down river in higher intervisibility. The comparison further suggested that the planter-elites did not necessarily site their houses to see each other. This argument was even stronger when considering the undocumented portions of the lower East Branch on the north side. Documentation of the upper East Branch on the north side from Richmond to Limerick Plantations was more complete than the lower East Branch on the north side between Fish Pond and Richmond Plantations. Additionally, the inclusion of the currently undocumented planter-elite houses would only strengthen the argument that planter-elite chose views of the river over views of each other when siting their houses.

Twenty-one enslaved laborer settlements were identified in the East Branch community. Of the twenty-one settlements, only five settlements were not located within proximity of a planter-elite house. Initially, the enslaved laborer line-of-sight viewshed indicated a similar pattern of visibility as the planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed along the river corridor with additional potential visibility among remote inland settlements (figure 6.4B); however, the CVA revealed a slightly different representation of intervisibility among the enslaved laborers. As previously stated, a CVA returned values between green (one) and red (twelve and thirteen for planter-elite and enslaved laborers, respectively) that indicated low to high intervisibility - the higher the value, the higher intervisibility. Intervisibility between enslaved laborer settlements fell
between one (green) and five (greenish-yellow); the threshold value was five (1.16%) of the total cells (table 6.3), which was .72% lower than the planter-elite CVA threshold value (table 6.2). Values above five were negligible (less than 1%); however, unlike the planter-elite CVA these negligible values represented areas of potential visual and/or cognitive significance for the enslaved laborers.

The negligible areas that indicated high intervisibility were located on higher inland elevations near the northwest boundary of the study area. Not only was this an area of higher elevation but it was also devoid of any known planter-elite houses. Perhaps enslaved laborers used this area for clandestine activities, such as rituals or hiding. At Smokey Hill Plantation, which did not contain an enslaved laborer settlement, there was a significant lack of intervisibility from any surrounding enslaved settlements. By contrast, intervisibility was higher at the enslaved laborer settlements between Akinfield, Spring Hill, and Moreland Plantations than between the corresponding planter-elite houses on the same plantations, particularly between Akinfield and Spring Hill Plantations. In the future, additional research and ground-truthing should be carried out to investigate the topographical differences in this area.

Enslaved laborer’s intervisibility within the river corridor corresponded closely with the planter-elite intervisibility with a few exceptions. Enslaved laborer settlement intervisibility CVA values were closer to 1 – 2 (green) as
opposed to the planter-elite house intervisibility CVA values of 4 – 5 (green-yellow). Perhaps the planter-elites sited these enslaved laborer settlements to discourage riverine social interaction among the enslaved laborers. This argument was further strengthened when considering two upriver areas lacking any intervisibility between enslaved laborer settlements. The first void occurred between Blessing and Middleburg Plantations along the East Branch south of the centerline. The second void occurred on the north side of the East Branch centerline along Bossis and Hyde Park Plantations and on south of the centerline at Silk Hope Plantation. It must be noted that information was lacking on several plantations (Bonneau Ferry and Silk Hope) that would alter the CVA intervisibility results. Further, archival investigations should be carried out to locate these plats and the model run again before any level of certainty can be established regarding this interpretation.

Different patterns emerged when the planter-elite and enslaved laborer CVAs were combined (figure 6.5). Enslaved laborer settlements’ intervisibility fell between one (green) and ten (greenish-yellow); the threshold value was eight (1.26%) of the total cells (table 6.4), which was .62% lower than the planter-elite CVA (table 6.2) and .10% higher than the enslaved laborer CVA (table 6.3). Values above eight were negligible (less than 1%); however, unlike the planter-elite CVA and the enslaved laborer CVA negligible values of nine (1,691 or .82%)
and ten (999 or .49%) represented areas of potential visual and/or cognitive significance for both planter-elites and enslaved laborers within the river corridor.

The majority of combined CVA intervisibility continued along the East Branch within the river corridor boundaries where complete intervisibility existed; however, the low values (green) indicated possible surveillance and/or counter-surveillance by both groups. Higher areas of intervisibility within the corridor occurred at the French Quarter Creek entrance between Hagan and Blessing Plantations and along the East Branch centerline between Richmond and Middleburg Plantations. Along French Quarter Creek, the planter-elite CVA indicated intervisibility on the north side only while the enslaved laborer CVA indicated intervisibility on both sides. The combined CVA suggested that perhaps the enslaved laborers exercised more visual control along the creek.

As with the planter-elite and the enslaved laborer CVAs, four hot spots emerged in the combined CVA along the west and northwest boundary of the study area. As indicated on figure 6.4B of the enslaved laborer CVA, the three hot spots along the northwest boundary reappeared but a fourth hot spot emerged near the study area’s west boundary, slightly north of the Comingtee Plantation planter-elite house. It is suggested that future investigation be
undertaken in this area. Was this an area jointly recognized and/or avoided by both groups? Or was it topographically of higher elevation?

**Grouped Visibility**

The next section examines viewsheds at the scale of several plantation groups together in the same manner as presented in chapter four. Each group contains a chart of the relevant owners from 1780 to 1822. Then a pair of line-of-sight viewsheds representing potential visibility from the planter-elite houses (labeled A to the left) and from the enslaved laborer settlements highlighted in turquoise (labeled B to the right) were analyzed.

**Group I: Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, Midway, and St. James Plantations**

The Ball family owned and operated this group of plantations located on the north side of the East Branch. Elias Ball III (1752-1810) was the first permanent Ball resident at Limerick Plantation, from which he managed Comingtee Plantation (BFP 1785-1809; Ball 1998:217; Deas 1909:118, 123; Lees 1978:68; Stoney 1932:176). John Ball Sr. (1760-1817) resided at Kensington Plantation and used Hyde Park Plantation not as a residence but rather as a ‘maroon’ house (Deas 109:92-93; Miles 2004:65). Isaac Ball (1785-1825) resided at Limerick Plantation as well as managed Midway Plantation (BFP; Ball 1998:314; Deas 1909:136; Lees 1978:68). Analyses included information from all extant plats from these plantations.
Limerick, Kensington, and Hyde Park planter-elite houses were located on the East Branch within the river corridor and their potential visibility was focused primarily within the river corridor of the East Branch (figure 6.6A). The planter-elite house at Silk Hope Plantation on the south side of the East Branch was potentially viewable from the planter-elite houses at these plantations; however, potential visibility towards Quinby Plantation did not include its planter-elite house, which was just beyond the river corridor. Additionally, the planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed revealed potential visibility at higher inland elevations. In reality, planter-elite visibility to this area may be obstructed by vegetation and/or out of actual visual range.

Only two proximate enslaved laborer settlements, one at Limerick Plantation and another at Kensington Plantation, were located in the river corridor within sight of their respective planter-elite houses. The enslaved laborer settlement line-of-sight viewshed shares similar potential visibility as the planter-elite line-of-sight of the river corridor. In contrast, the enslaved laborer viewshed lacked potential visibility below Hyde Park Plantation along the East Branch north of the centerline and offered only limited potential visibility below Silk Hope Plantation along the East Branch south of the centerline. As shown in figure 6.6B, the five inland enslaved laborer settlements revealed potential
visibility directed towards the inland areas rather than towards the river corridor.

**Group II: Comingtee/Stoke, Fishpond, and Hut Plantations**

Initially, the Ball family owned these three plantations on the north side of the East Branch. Comingtee/Stoke Plantation, the ancestral Ball family seat, remained with the Ball family when Fishpond was sold in 1708 to a Harleston cousin. Although all three plantations were in the East Branch neighborhood, none of their houses was located within the river corridor. Comingtee/Stoke Plantation planter-elite house was oriented westward towards the West Branch of Cooper River. Fishpond Plantation fronted on the East Branch but its planter-elite house was located inland beyond the river corridor. Analyses was performed with extant data from Comingtee/Stoke and Fishpond Plantations.

The planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed limited potential visibility to areas outside of the river corridor that were oriented towards the inland areas between the plantations (figure 6.6A). Potential visibility encompassed both the Comingtee/Stoke Plantation planter-elite house and its two enslaved laborer settlements but did not encompass similar structures at Fishpond Plantation. The enslaved laborer settlement line-of-sight viewshed was significantly different. From the three known settlements, potential visibility increased inland surrounding Fishpond Plantation as well as at the higher inland elevations along
the study area’s western boundary. Unlike the planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed, the enslaved laborer settlement viewshed included potential visibility within the river corridor on the East Branch south of the centerline just north of the French Quarter Creek entrance (figure 6.7B). The enslaved laborer settlement viewshed extended potential visibility across the East Branch to include the planter-elite house and enslaved laborer settlement at Blessing Plantation, the length of French Quarter Creek, and the planter-elite house and enslaved laborer settlement at Spring Hill Plantation. The viewshed also included potential visibility within the river corridor at the ‘T’ and portions of Hagan Plantation. Extended potential visibility suggested that the enslaved laborer settlements were located on higher elevation than the associated planter-elite houses.

**Group III: Bonneau Ferry, Villa, Richmond, Farmfield, and Bossis Plantations**

Except for Bonneau Ferry Plantation, Group III plantations were the property of the Harleston family with Richmond Plantation as the family home seat (Irving 1842:54, 70, 161-163; Steen 2011:24; Stoney 1932:144, 162). The Harleston family was connected through marriages to the Ashby, Rutledge, and Horry families. The French Huguenot Bonneau family owned Bonneau Ferry Plantation, which descended through this family (Cross 1983:5, 91-92; Irving 1842:51; Miles 2004:27; Stoney 1932:133). Of the five plantations in Group III, only
Bonneau Ferry lacked extant plats; therefore, the viewsheds represented only Richmond, Farmfield, Bossis, and Villa Plantations.

The planter-elite line-of-sight viewshed revealed potential visibility directed primarily towards the East Branch within the river corridor from the ‘T’ to Bossis and Quinby Plantations (figure 6.8A). Below Richmond Plantation, potential visibility was directed south of the centerline within the river corridor. Perhaps, if the location of the Bonneau Ferry planter-elite house was known, potential visibility would encompass both sides of the corridor. Outside the river corridor, the viewshed suggested potential inland visibility at higher elevations in the western portion of the study area as well as areas between Camp Vere and Smokey Hill Plantations located on the south side of the East Branch. Potential visibility stretched across French Quarter Creek to include both the planter-elite house and enslaved laborer settlement at Akinfield Plantation.

Potential visibility from the enslaved laborer settlements was directed towards the river corridor; however, potential visibility appeared to be fifty percent less than the planter-elites’ potential visibility (figure 6.8B). Enslaved laborer line-of-sight focused potential visibility along the East Branch centerline and south of the East Branch centerline between Middleburg and Quinby Plantations. North of the centerline, potential visibility encompassed the entire
river corridor between Bossis and Farmfield Plantations with limited potential visibility along the centerline between Farmfield and Richmond Plantations.

**Group IV: Windsor, Fishbrook, and Silk Hope Plantations**

Although the Harleston family had early ownership of Windsor Plantation, by 1786, the owners were not related to anyone in the East Branch community (Hawley 1946:5; Irving 1842:80; Orvin 1973:135; Smith 1911b:11; Stoney 1932:184). Fishbrook Plantation was the Quash family seat and remained in the Quash family. Descendants of the Quash family intermarried with the Harleston family. Silk Hope was owned by members of two families: first, as the Johnson family seat and later as the Manigault family seat (Orvin 1973:25; Smith 1917a:13). The Manigault family intermarried with the Ashby family of Quinby Plantation (Edgar 2006:585; Smith 1917a:13; Stoney 1932:170).

Because extant information was available from Windsor and Silk Hope Plantations only, the line-of-sight viewshed for Group IV was incomplete and represented only two planter-elite houses and one enslaved laborer settlement.

From Windsor Plantation, the line-of-sight viewshed was virtually identical from the planter-elite house and its proximate enslaved laborer settlement (figure 6.9). With the addition of the Silk Hope planter-elite house, line-of-sight viewshed extended potential visibility initially along both sides the river corridor between Kensington and Bossis Plantations and then along the
southern side of the river corridor to Middleburg Plantation (figure 6.8A). Additionally, planter-elite potential visibility existed within the river corridor from Silk Hope towards Fishpond Plantation.

**Group V: Quinby, Middleburg, Pompion Hill, Simons Ville/Horts/Halidon Hill, Smokey Hill, and Camp Vere Plantations**

The Shubrick family, related by marriage to the Ball family, owned Quinby Plantation (Ball 1929:2; Deas 1909:58-61, 178; Irving 1842:73; Orvin 1973:25; Smith 1917a:8; Stoney 1932:166). Middleburg Plantation was the French Huguenot Simons family seat. Pompion Hill Plantation had an early eighteenth-century association with both the Simons family and Middleburg Plantation, however, the Manigault family owned it during the study period.

Of the seven plantation groups examined, the planter-elite houses and enslaved laborer settlements of Group V exhibited an almost identical pattern of potential visibility with two exceptions. First, the enslaved laborer settlement viewshed exhibited slightly higher potential visibility within the river corridor near Quinby Plantation. And, second, the enslaved laborer settlement potential visibility was slightly lower near Camp Vere Plantation (figure 6.10B). Other areas of potential visibility outside the river corridor appeared to correspond with areas of higher elevation.
Group VI: Blessing, Cedar Hill, and Cherry Hill Plantations

The Deas family of St. James Goose Creek owned the Blessing Plantation when John Deas Sr. (1735-1790) divided it into three plantations: Blessing, Cedar Hill, and Cherry Hill (Irving 1842:52). The Deas and Broùn families intermarried with the Ashby and Ball families.

Although Group VI contained only one planter-elite house and its corresponding enslaved laborer settlement, the two viewsheds were vastly different (figure 6.11). Potential visibility from the planter-elite house was limited to the south side of the East Branch between the French Quarter Creek entrance and northward towards Camp Vere Plantation. Some planter-elite potential visibility extended inland from Blessing Plantation in a diagonal line towards the Cooper River between Akinfield and Moreland Plantations.

The enslaved laborer settlement viewshed presented an entirely different pattern. From this viewshed potential visibility extended within the river corridor westward towards Comingtee Plantation, northward towards Richmond Plantation, and southward towards Akinfield Plantation. Although the enslaved laborer settlement and planter-elite should have similar viewsheds, the enslaved laborer settlement viewshed lacked potential visibility in two areas: (1) within the river corridor towards Camp Vere Plantation and (2) along the diagonal line towards the Cooper River between Akinfield and Moreland.
Plantations. Future research needs to be performed to account for the distinct differences in potential visibility patterning.


The Huger family owned Hagan, Akinfield/Woodland, Moreland, and Blanchard/Benevento (originally a part of Hagan) Plantations. The Huger family intermarried with the Broün family, owners of Blessing Plantation. The Dearington family owned Spring Hill Plantation, which was on the French Quarter Creek and oriented towards the inland plantations to their east rather than towards the East Branch plantations.

Line-of-sight viewsheds of the planter-elite houses and their corresponding enslaved laborer settlements should have been identical because the planter-elite houses and the enslaved laborer settlements were located in close proximity to each other, respectively. The line-of-sight viewsheds revealed similar potential visibility along the Cooper River along the southwest boundary of the study area. However, the two viewsheds as shown in figure 6.12 provided different potential visibility patterns. The planter-elite viewshed indicated heavy potential visibility on both sides of the East Branch within the river corridor from the ‘T’ northward to Camp Vere Plantation and extending on the south side of
the East Branch to Middleburg Plantation (figure 6.12A). This planter-elite viewshed lacked visibility towards the inland areas on the south side of the East Branch. Specifically, there was a lack of potential visibility in the lower reaches of French Quarter Creek and around Spring Hill Plantation.

From the enslaved laborer settlement line-of-sight viewshed, potential visibility revealed a similar potential visibility pattern towards the Cooper River along Hagan, Akinfiefield, and Moreland Plantations (figure 6.12B). However, in contrast, potential enslaved laborer settlement visibility was significantly higher in the inland area towards, and inclusive of, French Quarter Creek and Spring Hill Plantation than the planter-elite potential visibility. Limited potential visibility from the enslaved laborer settlements also occurred within the river corridor. Portions of the north side of the river corridor from Comingtee to north of Fishpond were potentially visible as well as a portion of the south side of the river corridor near the entrance of French Quarter Creek.

**East Branch Neighbor-Assisted Surveillance**

Drawing upon Surface-Evans’s (2012) study that created cost-catchments to simulate ‘areas of influence’, buffers were employed to represent possibly rings of social interaction and neighbor-assisted surveillance. Surface-Evans converted cost corridors from a raster into a polygon to examine statistically any inclusive cultural and natural features within the corridors; these polygons
became site-cost catchments. Surface-Evans concluded that, “cost catchments provide[d] a more nuanced picture of accessibility to aspects of a social landscape” (2012:142). The buffer rings in this study served a similar purpose as Surface-Evans’s catchments.

Based upon Higuchi’s distance parameters, buffers were created at one hundred fifty meters, three hundred sixty meters, six hundred sixty meters, and capped by a one thousand meter-threshold. At the regional scale, it was unnecessary to set a buffer at fifteen meters; instead, the one hundred fifty-meter buffer represented the zone of intimate social interaction or neighbor-assisted surveillance. The three hundred sixty-meter buffer represented the zone of sensory (hearing and smelling) impact. Additionally, the three hundred sixty-meter buffer as well as the six hundred sixty-meter buffer represented zones of vision acuity (with decreasing perfect vision). Finally, the one thousand-meter maximum threshold represented a distance at which only the horizon would be viewable. In other words, viewsheds generated beyond the threshold were immaterial and not considered valid for social interaction or neighbor-assisted surveillance. Figure 6.13 represents potential planter-elite neighbor-assisted surveillance (A) and enslaved laborer social interaction (B). The results of combining the planter-elite neighbor-assisted surveillance and the enslaved
laborer social interaction, shown in Figure 6.14, represented areas of extent of potential neighbor-assisted surveillance.

The planter-elite neighbor-assisted surveillance model (figure 6.13A) revealed a neighborhood that was potentially less spatially integrated than expected based on the results of the various line-of-sight viewsheds, CVA models, and previous archival research (see chapters three and four). None of the planter-elite houses were located within the one hundred fifty-meter intimacy zone (shown in light blue) of each other. The model suggested that although most of the East Branch plantations fronted along the river, the size of each plantation provided enough acreage for each planter to spread out along the river. Also, these plantations lacked neighbor-assisted surveillance within the three hundred sixty-meter sensory (hearing and smelling) zone (shown in medium blue); at this level, planter-elites would have been able to hear (i.e. sounds) or smell (i.e. smoke or cooking) certain activities from their neighbors.

The model suggested that neighbor-assisted surveillance began within the zone of ‘perfect’ vision (shown in red), which indicated that while planter-elites may not have had complete sensorial (hearing and smelling) knowledge of their neighbors’ activities, they potentially saw, with an unencumbered view, activities at their neighbors’ residence. In particular, planter-elite houses at four plantations, located on both sides of the East Branch, fell within this zone: Hyde
Park, Bossis, Silk Hope, and Quinby. Further, Hyde Park, Bossis, and Silk Hope displayed potential neighbor-assisted surveillance with each other, while the planter-elite house at Quinby Plantation alone shared potential neighbor-assisted surveillance with the Silk Hope Plantation planter-elite house.

The final zone of potential neighbor-assisted surveillance, limited at one thousand meters (shown in green), represented the outer limit of visibility between planter-elite houses. The model suggested that three clusters fell within the zone of the maximum visible threshold. In the first cluster, the neighbor-assisted surveillance between Hyde Park, Bossis, Silk Hope and Quinby potentially expanded northward to include Kensington and Limerick Plantations. The lack of neighbor-assisted surveillance between Kensington and Hyde Park Plantation was notable because John Ball of Kensington used Hyde Park Plantation as a ‘maroon’ residence. As a ‘maroon’ residence, Hyde Park was not occupied year-round but rather as a ‘get away’ residence.

The second cluster included Richmond, Middleburg, Camp Vere, and Blessing Plantations. Potentially Richmond and Middleburg Plantations, on opposite sides of the East Branch, shared the closest neighbor-assisted surveillance with each other that was just beyond the sensory zone. Richmond and Camp Vere Plantations, also located opposite each other on the East Branch, shared potentially close neighbor-assisted surveillance with each other. As part
of the second cluster, Blessing Plantation, located on the south side of French Quarter Creek opposite Camp Vere, shared neighbor-assisted surveillance only with Camp Vere Plantation.

The third cluster of planter-elite houses included Comingtee and Fishpond Plantations. The model suggested that the two plantations were far enough apart to potentially afford some privacy yet close enough to share neighbor-assisted surveillance within the one thousand-meter threshold.

The model suggested that planter-elite houses at six plantations were totally socially isolated from other planter-elite houses: Windsor, Smokey Hill, Spring Hill, Moreland, Akinfield, and Hagan Plantations. Of the isolated plantations, Hagan and Akinfield Plantations on the East Branch and Spring Hill Plantation on French Quarter Creek fell within the river corridor. The other three plantations – Windsor, Smokey Hill, and Moreland – were inland plantations and displayed no neighbor-assisted surveillance with other East Branch plantations.

The model revealed a higher level of potential social interaction between the enslaved laborer settlements (figure 6.13B). Enslaved laborer settlements within the plantation core fell within the one hundred fifty-meter zone of intimacy with their respective planter-elite house. Three clusters of enslaved laborer settlements fell within the three hundred sixty-meter sensory zone
(shown in medium blue) of each other: (1) two settlements at Comingtee Plantation, (2) two settlements at Middleburg Plantation, and (3) the settlements between Bossis and Hyde Park Plantations. These enslaved laborer settlements were close enough to each other that they potentially communicated with each other using either sound and/or smell.

Only two clusters revealed social interaction among enslaved laborer settlements within the six hundred sixty-meter ‘perfect’ vision zone (shown in red): (1) between the Tanner Road settlement at Limerick Plantation and the Windsor Plantation enslaved laborer settlement and (2) between the two enslaved laborer settlements at Comingtee Plantation and the enslaved laborer settlement at Fishpond Plantation. These clusters were located outside of the river corridor.

Within the one thousand-meter threshold zone (shown in green), the model suggested potential social interaction among several enslaved laborer settlements. The two inland Limerick enslaved laborer settlements and the Windsor enslaved laborer settlement exhibited potential social interaction among themselves, but they also shared potential social interaction with a cluster that included social interaction among the plantation core enslaved laborer settlements at Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, Bossis, Farmfield; the inland
enslaved laborer settlement at St. James Plantation; and the two enslaved laborer settlements at Middleburg Plantation.

Additionally, the enslaved laborer settlements at Blessing and Camp Vere Plantations exhibited potential social interaction with each other but also potential social interaction with the cluster described above through potential social interaction among the Camp Vere Plantation enslaved laborer settlement and Richmond Plantation enslaved laborer settlement. The two-isolated inland enslaved laborer settlements near the western boundary of the study area potentially socially interacted with each other within the one thousand-meter threshold.

Three enslaved laborer settlements lacked any potential social interaction with other settlements: two inland enslaved laborer settlements at Moreland and Spring Hill Plantations and the enslaved laborer settlement at Quinby Plantation on Quinby Creek. While the model of the planer-elite houses suggested a lack of potential social interaction between Hagan and Akinfield Plantation, the enslaved laborer settlement model suggested potential social interaction among their respective enslaved laborer settlements within the one thousand-meter threshold zone. The model suggested that while the planter-elite class could surveil and control their enslaved laborers, social proximity among and between the various African and African-American enslaved laborers potentially
strengthened family and community bonds and afforded them opportunities to retain, create, and promote African-based traditions within the East Branch.

Figure 6.14 represents the results of the model that combined the planter-elite neighbor-assisted surveillance and the enslaved laborer settlement social interaction. Overall, this model suggested that the planter-elite could exert a high level of social control over their enslaved laborers on the upper river-oriented portions of the East Branch at plantations between Blessing and Windsor Plantations. Two additional outlying clusters of planter-elite neighbor-assisted surveilled existed: (1) the Comingtee/Fishpond Plantation cluster and (2) the Hagan/Akinfield Plantation cluster. The model provided no evidence of planter-elite neighbor-assisted surveillance at the two-remote inland enslaved laborer settlements near the west boundary formed a purely enslaved laborer cluster. Spring Hill and Moreland Plantations represented two self-contained individual clusters of a single planter-elite house and a single enslaved laborer settlement. Therefore, this model supported the argument that among and between the planter-elite and enslaved laborer classes the East Branch was a very close knit and highly socially interactive neighborhood. The model also supported that argument that with few exceptions, the degree to which planter-elites would have been able to rely upon their neighbors and kin to assist in the surveillance and control of their enslaved laborers.
Conclusion

This chapter was designed to present visual analysis models to test whether or not the panoptic plantation model applied to the East Branch community. Line-of-sight viewsheds and CVAs provided visual tools that can assist historical archaeologists in addressing cognitive questions. What influences did planter-elites take into consideration when siting their homes? Were they driven by social considerations, such as a view of their neighbors? Were they driven by aesthetic considerations, such as a view of the river? Were they simply driven by the natural landscape to settle on the best land with the proper elevation? Did view have no relationship with siting? What implications did the planter-elite’s decisions have upon their enslaved laborers who were not privileged to site their settlements in locations of their choosing? The various model results suggested a significant positive correlation between the location of planter-elite houses and potential visual surveillance of riverine activities. Additionally, the models suggested an equally significant positive correlation between enslaved laborers settlements and potential counter-surveillance along the East Branch of the Cooper River.

The most interesting finding was that line-of-sight viewsheds and CVAs produced significantly similar yet different results not only at the regional scale but also at the plantation group scale. Typically, line-of-sight viewsheds model
potential visibility across the landscape from a structure. By running a line-of-sight viewshed from the centerline of the East Branch of the Cooper River, the model suggested that more than half (fifty-five percent) of the planter-elite houses were located with preferences near the rivers and creeks. Further, by reclassifying the values contained in the viewshed, attention was focused to areas with potentially higher visibility. A comparison of the two results revealed that these areas need more focused visibility analyses.

One of the most significant findings to emerge from the visibility analyses was that both planter-elite and enslaved laborer potential visibility should be considered when applying the panoptic approach to plantations. Evidence from this study suggested that visibility was not always reciprocal. At the regional scale, both the planter-elite viewshed and the enslaved laborer viewshed suggested almost identical potential visibility of the East Branch as well as at several inland areas. The CVAs at the regional scale supported an almost identical river-focused visibility among the two groups as well. Additionally, the combined CVA suggested that the enslaved laborers exercised more visual control along French Quarter Creek than the planter-elite. Taken together these results suggested that regardless of group association, potential visibility was most likely towards either the East Branch or Cooper River (in the case of Hagan, Akinfield, and Moreland Plantations).
According to the panoptic plantation approach, it was presumed that enslaved laborer settlements sited within the plantation core of their respective planter-elite houses were within the purview of planter-elite surveillance and control. The theory also suggested that these two groups should share identical or near identical visibility. Contrary to expectations, visual analyses at the grouped plantation scale contradicted this general hypothesis.

Two groups exhibited visibility patterns that resulted in higher potential visibility from the viewpoint of the enslaved. First, planter-elite houses in Group II (Comingtee/Stoke and Fishpond) lacked any potential visual association with the East Branch yet potential visibility from their associated enslaved laborer settlements revealed potential visibility across the East Branch towards French Quarter Creek. Second, a similar pattern occurred in Group VI (Blessing, Cedar Hill, and Cherry Hill). The single planter-elite house in this group lacked any significant visibility of the East Branch. In contrast, the corresponding single enslaved laborer settlement exhibited significant visibility of the river as far away as the approach from the ‘T’. A possible explanation for these two results might be that the enslaved laborer settlements were sited on higher elevations than the planter-elite houses. The difference in elevation will be an important parameter for future visibility analyses. Group III (Bonneau Ferry, Villa, Richmond, Farmfield, and Bossis) was the only group that exhibited significantly higher
planter-elite potential visibility than its corresponding enslaved laborer settlement visibility. The enslaved laborer settlements potential visibility was focused northward while the planter-elite potential visibility included the same area and extended southward toward the ‘T.’ This finding was unexpected and suggested that the planter-elite houses were located on higher elevation than the enslaved laborer settlements.

Several viewshed analyses suggested an area of high visibility near the northwest boundary of the study area known as Little Hell Hole Bay. The enslaved laborer settlement CVA indicated high intervisibility. Interestingly, this correlation was related to the geological formation and higher elevation in this area of the study area. Not only was this an area of higher elevation but it was also devoid of any known planter-elite houses. Perhaps enslaved laborers used this remote area for clandestine activities, such as petit maroonage, rituals, or hiding. Several inland enslaved laborer settlements ringed the formation. Future ground truthing and archaeological survey is required to test this hypothesis.

Finally, can visual analysis models test the veracity of the existence of a tight-knit, kin-based community? As I presented in previous chapters, archival research suggested that the planter-elite and their enslaved laborers developed patterns of interconnectedness based upon an interdependent ‘closed’ society that distanced itself from the outside world. The buffer zones created in the
neighbor-assisted surveillance and social control models tested the spatial strength of these relationships and their distributions across the landscape. The model suggested that the enslaved laborers may have had more spatial opportunity for social interaction than the planter-elites neighbor-assisted surveillance permitted; however, when combining the two models, the planter-elites exhibited a pattern of high neighbor-assisted surveillance over most of their enslaved laborers.

Although the exclusion of several plats did not diminish the effect of potential visibility along the East Branch, the results cited here should be interpreted with caution. Documentation of the upper East Branch on the north side from Richmond to Limerick Plantations was more complete than the lower East Branch on the north side between Fish Pond and Richmond Plantations as well as the south side of the East Branch from Fishbrook to Quinby Plantations. Would the inclusion of the undocumented plantations strengthen or weaken the arguments that (1) planter-elites chose views of the river over views of each other when siting their houses, (2) potential visibility of either the planter-elites or enslaved laborers was towards the East Branch, or (3) neighbor-assisted surveillance and social control among the planter-elites and the enslaved laborers, individually or as a group increase or decrease? This study has demonstrated, for the first time, that potential visibility analyses should be
examined not only at different scales but also from different viewpoints within the same landscape.

Some of the issues emerging from these visibility analyses relate specifically to the enslaved laborers’ mobility through the landscape. I suggest that areas of potential high planter-elite visibility would be areas of avoidance by the enslaved laborers. In the next chapter, least cost analysis models were employed to examine more closely the links between landscape and enslaved laborer mobility in the East Branch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Cell Count</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 80</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>81 – 134</td>
<td>Moderately Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>135-196</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>197-329</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Cell Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,148</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18,639</td>
<td>9.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,208</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.017%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.004%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Cell Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40,697</td>
<td>19.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,541</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,240</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.004%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.4 Comparison CVA Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Cell Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>12.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,981</td>
<td>11.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,551</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,702</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,730</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,881</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Cell Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.008%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.001%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.1 East Branch River Viewshed and East Branch River Corridor
Figure 6.2 East Branch River Viewshed Natural Break Values
Figure 6.3 East Branch Viewsheds: (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.4 East Branch Cumulative Viewshed Analysis: (A) Planter-Elite and (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.5 East Branch Cumulative Viewshed Analysis for Enslaved Laborer & Planter-Elite
Figure 6.6 Group I Viewshed: Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, St. James, and Midway Plantations (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.7 Group II Viewshed: Comingtee/Stoke, Fishpond, and Hut Plantations (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.8 Group II Viewshed: Bonneau Ferry, Villa, Richmond, Farmfield, Bossis Plantations (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.9 Group IV Viewshed: Windsor, Fishbrook and Silk Hope Plantations (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.10 Group V Viewshed: Quinby, Middleburg, Simonville, Horts/Halidon Hill, Smokey Hill, Camp Vere, and Pompion Hill Plantations (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.11 Group VI Viewshed: Blessing, Cedar Hill and Cherry Hill Plantations (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.12 Group VII Viewshed: Hagan, Benevento, Akinfield, Moreland, and Spring Hill Plantations (A) Planter-Elite (B) Enslaved Laborer
Figure 6.13 Planter-Elite Neighbor-Assisted Surveillance based on Proximity: (A) and (B) Enslaved Laborer Social Interaction based on Proximity
Figure 6.14 East Branch Community Social Proximity and Neighbor-Assisted Surveillance based on proximity
Chart 6.1 Group I Owners 1780-1822: Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, St. James, and Midway Plantations
Chart 6.2 Group II Owners, 1780-1822: Comingtee/Stoke, Fishpond, and Hut Plantations
Chart 6.3 Group III Owners, 1780-1822: Bonneau Ferry, Villa, Richmond, Farmfield, and Bossis Plantations
Chart 6.4 Group IV Owners, 1780-1822: Windsor, Fishbrook, and Silk Hope Plantations
Chart 6.5 Group V Owners, 1780-1822: Quinby, Middleburg, Simons Ville, Horts/Halidon Hill, Smokey Hill, Camp Vere, and Pompion Hill Plantations
Chart 6.6 Group VI Owners, 1780-1822: Blessing, Cedar Hill, and Cherry Hill Plantations
Chart 6.7 Group VII Owners, 1780-1822: Hagan, Benevento, Akinfield, Moreland, and Spring Hill Plantations
CHAPTER SEVEN
ENSLaved LANDSCAPE AND MOBILITY

Scholars examining enslaved perceptions of landscapes employ descriptive terms such as ‘black landscape,’ ‘black cognitive environment,’ ‘alternative territorial system,’ ‘alternative geography,’ ‘fugitive landscapes,’ ‘rival geographies,’ and ‘landscapes of slavery’ (Camp 2004; Ellis and Ginsburg 2010; Ginsburg 2010; Isaacs 1999; Kaye 2007; McKittrick 2011; Quintana 2010; Upton 1985, 2010; Vlach 1993). For purpose of this dissertation, I make reference to landscape architect Rebecca Ginsburg who defines black landscapes “as the system of paths, places, and rhythm that a community of enslaved people created as an alternative, often as a refuge, to the landscape systems of planters and other whites” that was “largely secret and disguised” (2010:54). Ginsburg’s definition is in stark contrast to an earlier often cited definition by architectural historian Dell Upton (1985, 2010) whereby he states that the enslaved laborers perceived their world as ‘a series of spots,’ disjointed and compartmentalized. Although Upton recognizes that a “slave’s perception of landscape changed with experiences of moving through it,” he portrays the enslaved laborers’ world as static and passive (quote in Ginsburg 2010:122).
Newer studies, however, reveal that plantation space was highly contested and that the enslaved laborer’s landscape was more connected and fluid. For example, based on the theme of mobility, historian Stephanie M.H. Camp proposes the term ‘rival geographies’ to define how enslaved laborers created routes, itineraries, internal maps, and places of refuge. Influenced by Edward Said, Camp (2004:) concludes that the geography of enslaved laborers was influenced by the mobility of bodies, objects, and information within and around the plantation. Along similar lines, Katherine McKittrick, who focuses on black studies, cultural geography, and gender issues, argues that this same geography was a terrain of landscapes of “earth, flesh, memory, and imagination” (McKittrick in Aisha K. Finch 2015:52-53). The definitions offered by these two scholars are essential for defining the enslaved landscape of the East Branch. Depending upon theme, temporality, or spatial approach, there appears to be no single definition of a ‘black enslaved laborer landscape;’ definitions that situate at the forefront the study of the spaces and places where the enslaved laborers lived, worked, and developed a community are appropriate.

In the study of plantations and slavery, historical archaeologists tend to focus on binary models that often emphasize dichotomies between white versus black, free versus enslaved, European versus African, and control versus
resistance. For the most part, these studies focus on the plantation core: big house versus enslaved laborer settlement/quarter. The spatial study of slavery and resistance on plantation continues to be a prevalent theme in historical archaeology and other social sciences. This dissertation is not different in that respect; however, my focus expands beyond the core to include the possible areas of enslaved laborer activity beyond the perceived control of the planter-elites.

This chapter is influenced by the works of historians Anthony E. Kaye (2007) and Ryan Quintana (2010) and several anthropologists in Bates et al. (2016). These scholars offer an innovative way to examine resistance. Kaye, for example, suggests a reevaluation of the domination-resistance model. Not only does Kaye suggest that scholars should reframe and shift away from enslaved laborers power relations based solely on resistance, Kaye proposes centering the narrative on the enslaved laborers who created a ‘geography of intimate relations.’ Taking Kaye’s approach one step further, Quintana argues that although the plantation was a landscape defined by brutal labor, it was also a landscape filled with ‘spaces of possibilities’ for the enslaved laborers. In a recent volume addressing mobility among enslaved and marginalized groups in the Caribbean, Chenoweth and colleagues present case studies that study movement, place, and space. The common threads from these works that
influence this chapter are the enslaved laborers’ cognitive understanding of ‘knowing the land’ and their everyday mobility through the landscape. Enslaved laborers were far from passive acceptors of the hegemonic landscape that placed them under the perceived control of the planter-elite. Instead, enslaved laborers were active participants in everyday practices (habitus) that marked the landscape.

This chapter examines how habitual movements, what Bourdieu calls habitus, enabled the enslaved to (re)create a landscape that was meaningful for them. The primary research question is, if the planter-elites believed they controlled the plantation landscape, how did the enslaved laborers move through this perceived landscape and (re)create a landscape of their own? With the aid of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and a focus on the theme of mobility, least cost analyses (LCA) are employed to identify probable paths, corridors, or networks that suggest the enslaved laborers on the East Branch were neither passive nor idle victims of the planter-elite’s panoptic surveillance and control mechanisms. As mentioned in previous chapters, however, LCA modeling is a relatively new area of inquiry in historical archaeology (Herzog 2014; White and Surface-Evans 2012). This chapter contributes to the ongoing conversation about local and regional studies of slavery, plantations, and space
by exploring enslaved laborer mobility and the potential for locating sites of activities resulting from their mobility.

**Plantation Landscapes**

In the past, historical archaeologists focused on enslaved laborers’ house architecture, domestic space, and yards (c.f. Ferguson 1992; Fessler 2010; Garrow and Wheaton; Handler 1978; Heath 2010; Singleton 1999, 2010; Vlach 1993). Typically, these early studies included excavations at the site scale of the enslaved laborers’ domestic landscape, which included structures, fence lines, ditches, barrow pits, trash middens, planting holes, and subfloor storage pits (Heath 2010:169). Apart from recent work in the Caribbean, historical archaeologists rarely venture beyond the surrounding the enslaved laborer’s cabin in the Carolina Lowcountry studies (Chenoweth et al. 2016; see the Agha and Philips 2007 study of Dean Hall Plantation). I examine the enslaved landscape at the regional scale beyond the plantation core not only at the scale of the single plantation but at the regional scale of a group of plantations bounded together as a community on the East Branch of the Cooper River in the Carolina Lowcountry.

**Planter-elite Views of Enslaved Mobility**

The landscape of the planter-elite plantation was filled with symbols of their power. Emblematic of these symbols were work fields, enslaved laborer
quarters, public roads, and the planter-elite’s house. Besides being an economic machine, the plantation was “planned and developed to create and maintain a structure, order, and discipline” that at its core was subject to intensive surveillance and control (Delle 1998, 2014, 2016). In “The Chesapeake Plantation’s Social and Spatial Order” (1999), Terrance W. Epperson was one of the first historical archaeologists to address planter-elites’ surveillance and control of enslaved laborers’ landscape. Epperson recognized that although the enslaved laborers’ landscape was subject to the direct surveillance and control, the “interior spaces of quarters or woodlands ... were areas of relatively greater freedom” (1999:169). Drawing upon Denis Cosgrove’s (1985) “way of seeing” concept and Michel Foucault’s “how spaces were designed to make things seeable and seeable in a specific way” concept, Epperson concluded that the planter-elite maintained surveillance and incorporated the enslaved laborers into their rigid spatial order within the plantation core. Adding to this, Ginsburg concludes that “the black landscape was a way of knowing not just the land but also white people” (2010:63). In other words, the activities of enslaved laborers coexisted within the planter-elites’ space yet was not under the planter-elites’ control.

Although the planter-elite class was strictly aware of the bounded and rigid space they had created, their enslaved laborer force was responsible for the
creation and maintenance of the Lowcountry infrastructure, which included bridges, canals, rice mills, and roads (Anthony 2010:186). Reliance on enslaved labor to physically (re)shape the Carolina Lowcountry, instilled in the enslaved laborers an intimate familiarity with the landscape in a way that the planter-elite could not understand. While the planter-elite class viewed swamps and forests as unsafe and mysterious spaces, the enslaved laborers (re)created the landscape into circuits of labor, social networks, wayward acts, and ritual practices that were both seen and sanctioned as well as unseen and illicit. Kaye (2007) argues that this (re)creating of space recalibrated the balance of power.

The planter-elites’ lack of familiarity with the landscape and of how their enslaved laborers viewed the landscape allowed the enslaved laborers to (re)create and (re)define the landscape in a way that made sense to them. For instance, in quoting Erskine Clarke, Philip Morgan wrote that the enslaved laborers also learned that “the world of whites, with its straight roads leading to plantation houses and patriarchy, was not the only world or the only ways of understanding the landscape … Trails provided avenues of escape, swamps offered the promise of hiding places, and the imagination of the settlements included the possibility of freedom from white oppression” (Clarke in Morgan 2010:38-39). For example, the planter-elites viewed the enslaved laborers quarters, carefully ordered in rows or ‘streets’, as part of the working landscape
(Upton 1985, 2010:127). However, for the enslaved laborer their landscape included the cabins, as well as the fields, slave village, woods, and waterways (Brown 2012; Ginsburg 2010; Kaye 2007; Upton 1985, 2010). Personal gardens, a sanctioned space provided by the planter-elite, provided additional sustenance for the enslaved family and provided an ‘African’ space where they chose to plant in African ways their New World- and African-based foods, such as “corn, potatoes, tobacco, peanuts, water and sugar melons, pumpkins, bottle pumpkins” (Brown 2012:146).

Within this bounded space, East Branch planter-elites imagined the roads, river, bridges, and canals that the enslaved laborer force created as connectors linking their plantations to neighbors and Charleston. Foremost in planter-elites’ minds, these connectors were viewed as spaces that provided the safe delivery of kin, friends, and plantation goods. The enslaved laborers likely held different ideas about connectors; their connectors could have existed among the unseen trails in the woods and forests between plantations. In their edited volume, *Black Geographies and the Politics of Place* (2007), Clyde Woods and Katherine McKittrick argue that enslaved laborers created mental or cognitive maps of places that reflected “the tension between that which is mapped and that which is unknown.” Further, McKittrick (2011) argues that enslaved laborers became
‘black cartographers’ who, in their own way, mentally documented land masses, roads, routes, boundaries, etc.

**Mobility and Restrictions**

By necessity, the enslaved labor force, both skilled and field, had to be mobile for the plantation to operate efficiently and profitably. Enslaved laborers needed to cross boundaries to carry out their everyday functions such as building houses and fences, herding cattle, processing and transporting rice, and delivering goods not only from the East Branch of the Cooper River to Charleston but also to neighboring and distant plantations.

Typically, enslaved males were more mobile than enslaved women (Brown 2012; Quintana 2010). As a wagon driver, coachman, or foreman, an enslaved male might be seen accompanying a member of the planter-elite class on the roads. Enslaved males were often sent on errands, hired out, or worked to transported goods and produce. The most mobile enslaved males were boatmen who not only crafted the boats but also had access to boats for hunting and fishing or moving produce for the planter-elite along the riverine corridors (Brown 2012:8). With their unmarked freedom, enslaved male boatmen had access to other boatmen, peddlers, and runaways; they were conduits for information for the enslaved community (Brown 2012; Quintana 2010). Enslaved women, while less mobile than their male counterparts, were also mobile.
Enslaved women who worked as midwives, nurses, and body servants were known to move from plantation to plantation when necessary. Some enslaved women sought out midwives on other plantations or gave birth in spaces other than their cabin. Spouses living on different plantations were known to visit each other. Parents visited children who lived on different plantations.

Everyday practices (*habitus*) of the enslaved laborers marked the landscape in ways not understood by the planter-elites. As early as 1985, Upton recognized that enslaved laborers considered the work areas as part of their domain (1985; 2010:136). By centering the enslaved laborer in the discussion of plantation landscapes, it can be argued that the entire plantation was their domain. The enslaved laborers used every inch of the plantation to create and maintain ties with friends, relatives, spouses, and lovers.

Throughout the East Branch, the enslaved laborers (re)claimed the landscape through their everyday practices (*habitus*). Not only did they travel through public sanctioned spaces but we may assume they also claimed and legitimated unsanctioned liminal spaces. Liminal space existed in places between the legitimate sanctioned landscape and the illegitimate unsanctioned landscape. On Lowcountry plantations liminal space included springs, shores, rivers, fords, passes, crossroads, bridges, and marshes (Chenoweth *et al.* 2016). In other words, space that was unclaimed or deemed unsuitable by the planter-elite became
legitimate space for the enslaved. For example, spaces between plantations were liminal spaces where enslaved laborers could have met to engage in common but unsanctioned activities such as hunting in uncultivated fields, fishing in rivers and creeks, engaging in gaming and dancing, performing sacred rituals, hiding out, or visiting neighbors and partners.

Planter-elites’ public space often included footpaths between plantations leading to public roads or the public road itself. Sometimes visible boundaries between plantations included fences. To avoid being seen, enslaved laborers would likely have avoided these spaces by taking advantage of animal tracks, old Indian trails, or recreating their own paths to avoid open roads. By creating “a system of trails and spaces known to and apprehended by other” enslaved laborers, Ginsburg argued that these paths and trails “ran figuratively and literally under the noses of master and mistress” (2010:55, 63). Enslaved laborers exercised more autonomy in the woods, swamps, and cabins than in the rice fields and open spaces. Because the enslaved laborers became familiar with not only roads, canals, and terraces they also accumulated knowledge beyond the control of the planter-elite at distances beyond the rice fields and cabins.

Through their mobility, enslaved laborers (re)claimed public and liminal spaces for religious/spiritual, economic, and social activities. The discussion below focuses on the religious/spiritual and social activities; other scholars have
focused on the theme of sanctioned and illegal trading practices among the enslaved laborers and others (Brown 2010; Heath 2010; Quintana 2010). Many of these unsanctioned activities coexisted with the planter-elite class’s notion of surveillance yet were beyond the control of planter-elite (Ginsburg 2010).

Predominately from Central and West Africa, the original and the newly arrived enslaved laborers brought their cultural and spiritual worldviews with them. The steady influx of polycultural enslaved laborers onto the East Branch plantations provided numerous opportunities for the resident enslaved laborers to engage not only with elders from Africa but also with newly arrived Africans. Just as the planter-elite relied upon similarities in their languages, customs, cultures and shared kinship to promote a stable community so did the enslaved laborers on the plantations in the East Branch.

An example of how space was used for spiritual purposes is found in Ras Michael Brown’s *African-Atlantic Cultures and the South Carolina Lowcountry* (2012). Brown examines how the concepts of “the physical and spiritual landscapes … linked the Lowcountry to Africa” (2012:xiv). Spirits were known to reside near rivers, streams, or in the forests. Brown argues that through the Kongo cosmology, enslaved laborers conceived the “land of the living” (the visible, physical world) and the “land of the dead” (the invisible, spirit world) as embedded in the natural environment. Brown provides evidence of the simbi, a
spiritual entity, that was first documented in 1840 in the freshwater springs found near the headwaters of the Cooper River in upper St. John’s Berkeley parish. While an aspect of Kongo spiritual culture, Brown surmises that the *simbi* belief was widely disseminated and embraced among non-Congolese and non-Africans by the mid-nineteenth century. The concept may have been reinforced among the enslaved East Branch community when John Ball purchased Congo Joe between 1805 and 1808 for Midway Plantation (John Ball and Keating Simons Ball Books). Within Kongo cosmology, the forest, or *finda*, was a powerful spiritual space where one not only encountered the land of the living but also encountered the land of the dead. The *finda* was the domain for invisible forces, which included the spirits of special animals and certain people. In Brown’s study, the practice of burying the deceased near fields allowed the enslaved laborers to connect to their ancestors as well. Springs and pools of water or ponds were important spaces within the landscape. Brown concluded that enslaved laborers recreated the Lowcountry from a landscape of enslavement into a land of the living.

Enslaved laborers likely found ways to relieve the monotony of enslavement by absconding themselves in the swamps, forests, or fields where they worked. Known as ‘petite maroonage,’ these short unsanctioned but commonly recognized respites provided brief yet much needed ‘space’ for
enslaved laborers within the plantation. While some enslaved laborers were known to hide in “the dismal swamps” (cited by Schlesinger 1996:121), others simply hid in kitchens or attics. Maroonage nurtured the growth of black resistance and leadership.

Whether enslaved laborers travelled on foot or stowed away on boats, they would have found many opportunities for contact with others to exchange gossip, news and information. Enslaved laborers incorporated the larger plantation to meet their need (Heath 2010:169, 172). The springs, caves, shores, rivers, fords, passes, crossroads, bridges, forests, and marshes became theirs. As Dell Upton (1985, 2010:6) noted, “black landscapes … combined elements of the white landscape and of the quarters in a way that was peculiar to them and that existed outside the official articulated processional landscape of the great planter.”

Restrictions on Mobility

As the number of enslaved laborers grew, the Carolina Lowcountry planter-elite class instilled several mechanisms to control enslaved laborer mobility. Planter-elites viewed enslaved laborers in one of three ways: as passive laborers, violent rebels, or hapless wanderers (Quintana 2010:167). Passive laborers presented no immediate threat to the planter-elite. However, when
viewed as violent rebels or hapless wanderers, planter-elites feared that too much mobility was a threat to their perceived control.

Planter-elites and the white population in general believed the enslaved laborers gathered for only one of two reasons: to practice religion or to plot insurrections. Sunday was a typical day off for enslaved laborers under the task system which allowed a modicum amount of time for tasks of own labor or other activities. For example, planter-elites spent Christmas at the plantation because at “Festival the Negroes were allowed more liberty and fearing they might use it in a bad way the proprietors deemed it well they present themselves” (Waterhouse 2005:73). Planter-elites recognized and allowed a certain amount of necessary mobility during the daytime. However, activities undertaken by the enslaved laborers during the evenings or ‘twilight space,’ in the minds of the planter-elite class, could only lead to clandestine activities. Therefore, daytime mobility may or may not have been sanctioned but nighttime mobility was a definite risk.

As early as the 1690 “Act for The Better Ordering of Slaves,” the planter-elite imposed laws that restricted unauthorized enslaved laborer mobility (Roper 2007). For instance, enslaved laborers found off their ‘home’ plantation without written permission from their master were considered runaways. Punishment was severe, ranging from being branded with an R on the cheek, loss of an ear, castration of males, or cutting the tendon in one leg, to sentencing the enslaved
person to death. However, these laws were haphazardly applied and basically ignored.

Following the 1739 Stono Rebellion Act No. 670 entitled “An Act for The Better Ordering and Governing of Negroes and Other Slaves in This Province,” or the Negro Act, codified enslaved persons’ mobility (McCord 1840). For example, Section Three reinforced the requirement for enslaved persons to carry a pass or a ticket written in the words following:

“Permit this slave to be absent from Charlestown, (or any other town, or if he lives in the country, from Mr. X plantation, X parish,) for X days or hours; dated the X day of X.”

Section Five of the 1740 Code authorized the detainment and examination of any enslaved person found outside a house or plantation who was not accompanied by any white person. Violators of Section Thirty-six were subjected to a ‘moderate whipping’ if found wandering and meeting among themselves on the plantation, especially on Saturday nights, Sundays, and holidays. Section Forty-three prohibited more than seven enslaved males from traveling together without a white person.

One way the courts and state militia chose to deal with the enslaved was to create slave patrols, which South Carolina established in 1704 (c.f. Hadden 2003). Although few of the planter-elite class instituted the patrols during the Colonial period, the 1740 Code Sections five and thirty-six reestablished the need
to follow the laws more closely. Composed of ‘respectable’ elites and poor whites, the slave patrols looked for runaways, suspicious fires, and unusual gatherings. The objective of the patrols was to watch roads on Sundays and evenings. As a community-based form of enslaved laborer control, the patrol was designated to work at night on roads, in fields, and between their plantation neighbors. Because planter-elites and other whites lacked an intimate familiarity with the landscape, the patrols tended to limit their searches to constructed roads and well-known paths. Therefore, enslaved laborers used their intimate knowledge of the woods and swamps as an opportunity to (re)create the landscape to avoid direct surveillance by the patrol. Anthony E. Kaye (2007) argued that the imposition of the slave patrol defined acceptable space for the enslaved laborer. Further, in the struggle over space, the patrol merely monitored activities rather than stopped them.

As already mentioned, the issuance of passes/tickets was another method of control on enslaved laborer mobility. Passes, viewed as an extension of the planter-elite’s authority and ownership, had the ‘perceived’ power to differentiate between sanctioned and unsanctioned mobility. Kaye argued that passes were a way “to police the boundaries of intimate relations” (2007:53). Yet some planter-elites believed “that they (or their slaves) were above such limitations” and neglected to write passes/tickets on a regular basis (Hadden
2003:111). The perpetual mobility of some enslaved laborers made the necessity of written passes cumbersome for their owners.

Despite strong interest in controlling enslaved laborer mobility, the planter-elite class found it difficult to police their enslaved laborers. Many Lowcountry rice plantation consisted of hundreds, if not thousands, of acres that were not within the planter-elite’s immediate and direct control. Because of the planter-elite’s inability to control the entire landscape and the necessary requirement of a mobile enslaved labor force, control was only partial (Delle 2016:121; Ginsburg 2010).

Quintana (2010) argued that the planter-elite created a ‘contested violent landscape’ between 1810 and 1830. The reason for the violent landscape was fear. The reasons for fear were the Haitian Revolution, the 1816 Camden and the 1822 Denmark Vesey conspiracies, and rising abolitionism. Strong interest in controlling enslaved mobility in the South Carolina Lowcountry increased after the Denmark Vesey conspiracy. The state placed additional restrictions on enslaved mobility by limiting passes beyond the plantation boundaries. State-sanctioned vigilante groups like the South Carolina Association were created to suppress enslaved laborer uprisings (q.v. chapter four).
Least Cost-surface Analysis

This section focuses on least cost analyses (LCA) to investigate what possible pathways and/or corridors the enslaved laborers employed that were out of view of the planter-elite’s visual control. Various cost surface analyses were explored to locate probable paths, corridors, or networks that the enslaved laborers may have used to move through the ‘actual and perceived’ landscape. Examination of potential paths should lead to potential spaces of activities. As part of the historical archaeologist’s toolkit LCA has the potential to identify probable locations of activity for future excavations.

Least cost paths (LCPs) determined the cheapest route defined by costs from the (known) destination to the (known) source. The resultant path is one cell wide; in this case, the path is thirty meters. LCA required that the destination be specified; however, in the study of the East Branch the potential destination was unknown. To accommodate the requirement, the study area polygon shapefile was converted to multiple points – one per cell. Thusly, hypothetical destinations occurred at any point along the boundary.

ArcGIS defines cost as “a function of time, distance, or any other factor that incurs difficulty or an outlay of resources.” The LCA was performed using the distance toolset in the Spatial Analyst extension in ArcGIS desktop 10.5. Three tools were required to perform the model. (1) The cost distance (or cost-
weighted distance) tool equated distance as a cost factor, which is the cost to travel through any given cell. (2) The cost allocation tool identified the nearest (or least costly) source cell based on accumulated travel cost. (3) The cost back link tool identified the route to take from any cell, along the least-cost path, back to the nearest source.

To create the LCPs, a cost distance surface must be created which required a source dataset (enslaved laborer settlement point shapefile) and a cost raster as inputs. The cost raster, a single dataset that represented several criteria, identified the cost of traveling through each cell. The model drew upon several environmental and cultural cost factors that potentially affected mobility and path selection. First, cost consideration was taken from the work of previous historical archaeologists who identified three variables that influenced historic settlement patterns in the South Carolina Lowcountry: (1) accessibility to navigable waters, (2) suitable well-drained, fertile soils, and (3) proximity to other travel arteries, such as roads and paths (Drucker and Anthony 1979; Soil Systems, Inc. 1982; South and Hartley 1985; Stine 1991; Stine et al. 1993; Tidewater Atlantic Research, Inc. 1995; Whitley 2001; Zierden et al. 1986). Next, costs such as topography, slope, soils, land use, and hydrology were considered as variables or costs for the LCA models. Each of these datasets was in a different measurement system which could be directly compared to one another. Each
dataset was reclassified to a common scale - one to ten. One represented the lowest cost while ten represented the highest cost. An overlay of the river corridor created in chapter six provided another layer of analysis. These are by no means the only costs that influenced mobility; however, these were the variables chosen for the models.

As shown in table 7.1, the slope dataset is reclassified into ten quantiles based upon percentage to provide an equal number of observations in each class and the red line represents the maximum degree of slope in the East Branch.

As shown in Figure 7.1, the majority of the East Branch slope falls within the range of 0 to 2.17 percent or depressional to gently sloping (shown in green). Areas of surrounding rivers and creeks exhibit slopes ranging from 4.36 to 6.53 percent or gently to moderately sloping (shown primarily in yellow). A few areas exhibit slopes exceeding 6.3 percent but less than 7.62 percent, which are moderately sloping. It must be noted that a distinct vertical straight line appears where the original DEM quads join. This joint erroneously indicates slopes where none exist. Overall, slopes in the East Branch range between depressional to moderately sloping, which indicates that the topography is low and relatively uniform.

Soil attributes - drainage properties and trails/paths suitability - are additional mobility costs. Both criteria correlate well with each other and affect
trafficability, which is defined as the “ability of soil to support weight of humans, animals, and machines for moving about on the soil” (Fausey 2006:495). Based upon drainage and soil suitability, the soil dataset is reclassified as shown in table 7.1, the lower the number value and the higher the probability of mobility. Although soils in subtropical areas such as the Lowcountry tend to have high moisture content and a positive relationship with archaeological deposits, these soil areas are conducive to mobility.

As for trails and/or paths, soils categorized as slight are preferable because they exhibit minor mobility limitations that could be easily overcome. Soils of moderate suitability are either too sandy or exhibit moderate wetness; these soils require plan of some sort to overcome their limitations. Soils with severe suitability are too wet, too clayey, or flooded; these soils are unfavorable because their use for walking is limited and adjustments for trafficability are costly. The best soil scenario for walking or horseback are areas that exhibit one or more of the following qualities: (1) not wet but firm after rain, (2) not dusty when dry, (3) not subject to flooding and (4) have moderate slopes.

As shown in Figure 7.2, the East Branch exhibits all three suitability situations in the following proportions: slight (14.81%), moderate (37.50%), and severe (45.83%). Overall, 52.31% of the study area exhibits positive suitability for mobility. Areas of unsuitable soils appear in three clusters. The first cluster
appears in the upper reaches of the East Branch in and around Kensington, Limerick, and Windsor Plantations, as well as at Little Hell Hole Bay near the boundary. The second cluster of highly severe soil suitability appears in and around French Quarter Creek near Akinfield and Spring Hill Plantations. The third cluster of highly severe soil suitability appears in and around Comingtee and Fish Pond Plantations. A unique soil phenomenon extends in patches from Comingtee Plantation as far up the river to Richmond Plantation. With the exception of a small area near the Comingtee enslaved settlements, the majority of the area exhibited soils that were either severe suitability or slight suitability. Overall, the study area exhibits a clear mixture of the three types of soil suitability.

The land use and hydrology datasets are reclassified to represent the costs of moving across the physical landscape. As shown in table 7.3 only wetlands and water-related areas are reclassified; all other land uses are discarded. To account for the high level of mobility across these features, these attributes are reclassified as ten, the highest class, to represent impediments to mobility across the landscape. Figure 7.3 represent the similarities and differences between the two datasets, which are combined to identify all pertinent wetland and water features.
After reclassification, each of the four datasets are combined using the Spatial Analyst Math Algebra tool to create a cost raster shown in figure 7.4. Map Algebra permits the execution of all Spatial Analyst tools, operators, and functions to perform geographic analysis. By identifying the cost of travel through each cell in the raster, the cost raster represents the cumulative cost of traveling from every cell in the study area to each enslaved labor settlement. The cost assigned to each cell represents the cost per unit distance for moving through the cell. For example, in the current model the cost raster cell size is thirty meters, therefore if the cell cost value is ten, then the final cost of that cell is three hundred units. In other words, the final value per cell is the cell size multiplied by the cost value. Although the four datasets are given equal influence, each individual dataset influences the model differently.

As shown in table 7.4, areas shown in light blue represent the lowest friction or cost for movement across the landscape while the areas in dark blue represent the highest friction or cost for movement across the landscape. The results are reclassified into four quantiles and the cost values range between five and forty. The breakdown of each quantile is as follows: (1) values five to nine (37.84%), (2) values more than nine and at least sixteen (21.26%), (3) values more than sixteen and up to twenty-four (24.57%), and (4) values more than twenty-four but less than forty (14.23%). The best cost combination for mobility requires
level slopes on good soil. Areas that prevent mobility are wetlands and other water resources with poor or very poor soils. Based only on cost values, a little more than one-third of the study area exhibited good conditions for mobility. This cost raster became the input raster to calculate the cost distance, cost allocation, cost back link, and the cost path analyses.

**Euclidean Distance**

First, a Euclidean Distance analysis is performed to determine the closest direction from one enslaved laborer settlement to another. Euclidean distance does not consider any of the costs identified above. Essentially the directions shown are straight forward or ‘as the crow flies.’

Nolan and Cook’s creation of ‘control’ surfaces to study past human movement influenced this dissertation. Using ArcGIS 9.3 they created circular catchments that were then divided into forty-five-degree wedges representing cardinal and sub-cardinal directions. Nolan and Cook performed isotropic LCP analysis for each wedge/zone to “get a general picture of the avenues most likely to be traveled in any direction irrespective of the location of known sites” (2012:75). Accordingly, they suggested that this method prevented bias being introduced into the analysis based on “extant distributional knowledge.” Nolan and Cook concluded that the control paths can be used to “identify areas in need of survey ... and/or to evaluate the nature ... of the site ... in a regional
interaction network” (2012:89). For the study of the East Branch, the Euclidean Distance tool in ArcMap 10.5.1 functions in a similar manner.

Figure 7.5 shows the azimuth direction from the south in a three hundred sixty-degree circle or compass, with three hundred sixty being to the north and one to the east; the remaining values increase clockwise. The compass reveals the direction of the nearest enslaved laborer settlement to another settlement. There is a clear pattern of directional change where two or more directional paths meet. The major drawback of the Euclidean direction analysis is that travel is unrealistically represented in straight lines to a specific location; this analysis does not avoid obstacles such as the East Branch River, unsuitable soils, or the wetlands. In figure 7.5, the Euclidean direction reveals a strong east-southeast direction (light green and green) to reach the enslaved laborer settlements on the north side of the East Branch whereas the enslaved laborer settlements on the south side of the East Branch and two remote settlements near the western boundary clearly exhibit a more west-northwest orientation (purple and pink). When examining the enslaved laborer settlements on the north side of the East Branch, five settlements are accessible across the river from the west-southwest direction. Four enslaved laborer settlements are accessible across the river from the east-southeast direction. The enslaved laborer settlement at Hagan Plantation is accessible across the East Branch from the southeast-south-southwest
direction. The two enslaved laborer settlements at Middleburg Plantation share
the same directionality. Of particular note, the Euclidean direction clearly reveals
that the approach to most enslaved laborer settlements requires directional
change in mobility to a greater or lesser degree depending upon proximity to
each other.

Cost Distance

The Spatial Analyst Cost Distance (or cost-weighted distance) tool
modifies Euclidean distance by equating distance as a cost factor, which is the
cost to travel through any given cell as determined by the cost raster shown in
figure 7.4. For example, topographic features, such as a lake or pond, may be
closer, however, walking around or avoiding the lake or pond might be faster.
The advantage of the Cost Distance over Euclidean Distance is that Cost Distance
considers the movement of a traveler over the landscape. With the cost grid as
the input raster, the Cost Distance tool assigns a value to each cell of the output
grid that represents the least accumulative cost to getting back to the enslaved
laborer settlements (shown in yellow in figure 7.6). While the Euclidean
Direction reveals that all areas are accessible from each enslaved laborer
settlement, the Cost Distance reveals that as one moves further away from the
respective enslaved laborer settlement, costs increase.
In figure 7.6 areas with the greatest distance from the enslaved laborer settlement are shown in blue; therefore, according to cost distance analysis, mobility in these areas is least likely to occur or to occur infrequently. On the other end of the spectrum, only three clusters reveal areas of potentially high mobility in terms of low distance costs: (1) the two enslaved laborer settlements at Comingtee Plantation, (2) the two enslaved laborer settlements at Middleburg Plantation, and (3) the enslaved laborer settlement at Hyde Park and Bossis Plantations. A breaking point (shown in orange) appears that indicates increasing costs of mobility that begin to either prevent or hinder mobility. For example, there are impediments between (1) the Tanner Road settlement and the Windsor Plantation settlement, (2) the two remote settlements near the western boundary, and (3) the settlements at Bossis Plantation and Farmfield Plantation. Three plantation core enslaved laborer settlements at Limerick, Quinby, and Spring Hill Plantation appear to be isolated from all other enslaved laborer settlements in terms of mobility costs.

Cost Allocation

The Cost Allocation tool identifies a zone around each enslaved laborer settlement that could be reached with the least accumulative cost. In other words, figure 7.7 identifies the area of mobility from each enslaved laborer settlement based on cost of mobility. One way to look at these zones is as areas of
frequent use by the respective enslaved laborers. It must be noted that the zones of allocation do not follow the boundaries as determined by the planter-elite. For example, the zones around the core settlement at Limerick Plantation and Windsor Plantation appear to include portions of Fishbrook and Silk Hope Plantations. The zones at the Kensington and Hyde Park core settlements extend across the East Branch to include portions of Silk Hope and Quinby Plantations. Separated zones appear at the two settlements at Comingtee Plantation and the two settlements at Middleburg Planation. With additional site locations for the non-represented enslaved laborer settlements at Bonneau Ferry, Fishbrook, and Silk Hope could substantial alter the location and size of the zones. It is recommended that research continue to locate plats for these plantations with better documentation to update this analysis.

**Cost Back Link**

The Cost Back Link tool provides a road map, identifying the route to take from any cell, along the least-cost path, back to the nearest source. The back link contains values of zero through eight, which defines the neighbor cell that is the next cell on the least accumulation path to the least cost source, an enslaved laborer settlement. If the path passes into the right neighbor, the cell value is one, for the lower right diagonal cell the value is two, and continues clockwise. The source cell (enslaved laborer settlement) is value zero.
The middle chart indicates the count for each cell within the cost back link analysis. The central figure in the middle chart represents the twenty-four enslaved laborer settlements. According to the cost back link statistics, the majority of the potential routes should originate from the northwest, north, or west direction in descending order and account for 46.15% of the total potential routes. Fewest potential routes originate from the southeast, northeast, or south direction and account for 33.13% of the total potential routes. In fact, the back link predicts that the highest percentage of potential routes should originate from the northwest and the lowest percentage of potential routes should originate from the southeast. In other words, enslaved laborer mobility should indicate a decidedly northwest trajectory from the majority of the settlements.

**Least Cost Path Analysis**

To perform the LCP, the model requires the cost distance raster, cost back link raster, or a cost allocation raster. Utilizing the cost distance raster, the cost path tool identifies the route to take from any cell, along the least cost path, back to the nearest enslaved laborer settlement. Each path returns a value based on the number of paths. For instance, the first path is numbered three, the second path is numbered four, and so on. The value of two is reserved for merged portions of paths where a common path exists. Merged portions of paths are numbered two because the merged portion belong to both paths on either side of the merge. For
this study, the least cost path is calculated from each cell, which results in multiple paths, one path for each cell.

The Cost Path tool is used to find the best route(s) that the enslaved laborers may have chosen to avoid surveillance by the planter-elite. This path is one cell wide and is the least costly route relative to the costs defined in the cost raster. For this analysis, two least cost path analyses are performed. The first analysis results in paths that travel from the edge of the study area to the various enslaved laborer settlements. It must be noted that the boundary polygon points are located around the edge, which results in some paths running along the edge. These paths are removed from the analysis.

Twenty-four enslaved laborer settlements are identified in the East Branch study area. The first LCP shown in Figure 7.9A reveals multiple potential paths from all but nine of the enslaved settlements leading toward the outer boundaries. The second LCP analysis reveals multiple potential paths traveling from the center of the East Branch towards the enslaved laborer settlements. As shown in figure 7.9B, virtually all enslaved laborer settlements in or near the river corridor, with the exception of one settlement at Comingtee, reveal potential paths that travel through the corridor. As discussion in the previous chapter, the corridor represents the areas within view of the centerline of the river; as such, these potential paths would fall within the purview of planter-elite
surveillance. Therefore, mobility along each of these paths increases the risk of planter-elite surveillance.

In figure 7.9C, both sets of the LCP analyses are combined. Enslaved laborers settlements near the ‘T’ at Comingtee, Fishpond, and Hagan Plantations reveal multiple potential paths that offer mobility towards the East Branch as well as away from it. Closer to the headwaters of the East Branch, multiple potential paths towards and away from the river occur at the enslaved laborer settlement at Quinby Plantation, the two enslaved laborer settlements at Middleburg Plantation, and the enslaved laborer settlement at Camp Vere Plantation; however, at these plantations the potential paths towards the East Branch fall within the river corridor and risk planter-elite surveillance. In a closer examination of the combined LCP analyses, a pattern emerges of dramatic absence of potential outward mobility from the enslaved laborer settlements along the north side of the East Branch. This absence is in stark contrast to the potential outward paths from the enslaved laborer settlements along the south side of the East Branch. Finally, the LCP analysis failed to identify any paths from the St. James settlement. This anomaly requires further investigation. Perhaps, the settlement at St. James is environmentally isolated, which could potentially restrict mobility without incurring risk.
Cost Connectivity

The Cost Connectivity tool, which defines the optimum network of LCPs, produces a map that displays potential mobility between zones of enslaved laborer settlements; potential paths are shown in white in figure 7.10. Several interesting patterns appear. First, there is no direct connection from the core enslaved laborer settlement at Limerick Plantation with the neighboring core enslaved laborer settlement at Kensington Plantation. Both settlements are connected via separate paths to the enslaved laborer settlement at St. James Plantation. Connectivity continues from St. James to the remote settlements near the western boundary. Second, a potential path indicates a connection from the core enslaved laborer settlement at Richmond Plantation, crosses the East Branch River to the two enslaved laborers settlements at Middleburg Plantation; the implication is that the East Branch River is not an impediment between the two plantations. Third, the potential path leading from the enslaved laborer settlement at Blessing Plantation is impeded by French Quarter Creek to the neighboring enslaved laborer settlement at Hagan Plantation. Instead, the potential path follows the French Quarter Creek to the enslaved laborer settlement at Spring Hill Plantation before continuing to the enslaved laborer settlements at Moreland, Akinfield, and terminating at Hagan Plantations.
Next, a brief discussion follows that examines the impact of each cost surface and the potential paths in comparison with connectivity. Three costs surfaces are presented in figure 7.11: (A) slope, (B) soils, (C) waterways, and (D) a hypothetical land use.

The fact that no potential paths extend from the enslaved laborer settlement at St. James Plantation was mentioned earlier in this chapter. Based on the connectivity analysis, a potential path should connect St. James settlement to Limerick Plantation to the east and the two remote settlements to the west. However, upon closer examination of the cost surfaces it becomes apparent that although situated on moderate soils with very gently sloping topography, the St. James settlement is surrounded by highly unsuitable soils, wetlands, and water features that reduce mobility.

Ideally, the LCP analysis reveals potential mobility predominately along the north side of the East Branch. Environmentally, this region offers depressional to level slopes with the best soils favorable for mobility. However, realistically these paths are not feasible; not only are the paths in waterways but they are also within the river corridor, an area of high risk for planter-elite surveillance. The enslaved laborer settlement at Blessing Plantation exhibits potential paths toward the East Branch rather than towards Spring Hill Plantation as suggested by the connectivity analysis. One explanation could be
that highly unsuitable soils, moderately sloping topography, and the French Quarter Creek hinder mobility. Similar cost factors exist at the Camp Vere enslaved laborers settlement; however, the settlement exhibits potential paths not only towards the East Branch but also towards the eastern boundary. Are there other factors or costs that might explain the variation at neighboring settlements? Perhaps the distance of the slope change near forested wetlands is far enough away from the settlement that the change does not impede mobility whereas the enslaved laborer settlement at Blessing Plantation is on the slope change, which would encourage mobility towards the flatter topography of the East Branch.

Potential paths from the enslaved laborer settlements at Hagan, Akinfield, and Moreland Plantations extend through moderate soils, low topography, and non-forested wetlands towards the Cooper River. Additionally, potential paths from the enslaved laborer settlement at Hagan Plantation extend toward the ‘T’ and the East Branch. Unlike the connectivity analysis, there are no potential paths connecting the enslaved laborer settlements at these three plantations.

Connectivity analysis suggests that the Fishpond enslaved laborer settlement should share potential paths with the two enslaved laborer settlements at Comingtee Plantation. Not only is the Fishpond site separated from the sites at Comingtee Plantation by water, wetlands, and severe unsuitable
soil, but also the two Comingtee enslaved laborer settlements lack shared potential paths with each other. The Comingtee enslaved laborer settlement closest to the Fishpond site exhibits potential paths towards the East Branch as well as Cooper River while the other Comingtee enslaved laborer settlement presents potential paths only toward the Cooper River.

A hypothetical land use based on modern data with the potential cost path overlay is shown in figure 7.11D. As discussed in chapter five, recreating historic landscapes is difficult; therefore, this figure suggests a hypothetical physical landscape with the potential paths and enslaved laborer settlements. For illustration purposes, only attributes relative to the natural environment are included. Replanted upland pines and forested wetlands dominate the study area. Potentially, this was the natural landscape that the East Branch enslaved laborers recognized. Eliminating modern land use attributes can assist historical archaeologists in potentially illustrating and examining past historical environments.

Based on the literature, expected potential mobility towards the periphery of the East Branch community is confirmed by the above analysis. With destination points at either the periphery or river only, the results confirm the obvious. The LCP model suggests potential mobility: (1) either inward towards the East Branch, or (2) outward from the East Branch community, or (3) a combination of
both. Although the river corridor is included in the model as a negative cost factor (high risk), the effect of planter-elite visibility is missing. Adjustments to the model are needed. New questions are raised. Where are the potential paths between enslaved laborer settlements? How does planter-elite visibility effect enslaved laborer mobility across and between plantations?

Case Study

A case study that incorporates visibility as a cost factor is needed to address these questions. While the findings in chapter six suggest that planter-elites exercised potentially high visual surveillance and social control within the plantation core and of riverine activities, a case study would explore potential paths of enslaved laborers’ mobility between settlements despite the presumed confines of planter-elite visible control.

The completeness of documentation for the north side of the East Branch provided the opportunity to examine the strength and weakness of enslaved laborer mobility within the panoptic plantation landscape. This case study focuses primarily on Group I plantations as identified in earlier chapters that comprise Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, Midway, and St. James (see figure 5.1). Group I plantations include three plantation houses, five enslaved laborer settlements, and one settlement of a free mulatto and his slaves. Limerick, Kensington, and Hyde Park Plantations contain plantation houses on the north
side of the East Branch of the Cooper River. Both Midway and St. James Plantations are inland plantations without any identifiable plantation houses. All plantations, except Midway Plantation, include at least one identifiable enslaved laborer settlement; Limerick includes two enslaved laborer settlements and one settlement operated by a mulatto Ball descendant.

In 1929, The News and Courier reprinted Lydia C. Ball’s description of the house at Limerick Plantation (built c. 1700). According to Ball, the house was “a large two-story wooden dwelling with a garret or attic” with “three large rooms in the cellar or basement” (figure 7.13). Facing north, the house had a large piazza extending along all sides except the west side of the house. Four bedrooms, two on either side of a large hall, occupied the second floor.

The house at Kensington Plantation (built 1745), a thirty-minute walk from Limerick, is similarly constructed as the Limerick house (figure 7.14). The house at Hyde Park Plantation (built c. 1790) is a one and one-half-storied framed house on a raised basement with a front piazza that at one time extended on all sides (figure 7.15).

Less is known about the enslaved laborer settlements other than they were typically one-story framed structures. Among the numerous outbuildings near the Limerick house, Ball indicated that there were “many houses for the house-servants” and in the field “there was a row of houses for the field houses.”
Furthermore, Lydia Ball reminisced about activity near the Limerick house: “[o]n a bright, sunny morning in the fall or early winter … [she could] see the women with their bright colored handkerchiefs, and … [could] hear the sound of both men and women singing and keeping time with their flail-sticks as they hit the ground …”

Rural seventeenth-century plantation architecture did not resemble the typical ‘white columned mansion’ often imagined in Old South nostalgia. The extant house at Middleburg Plantation (built c. 1699) is a representation of the typical architecture found at frontier-era plantations. It is a two-storied structure with a one-story piazza on the front and back. Unfortunately, few seventeenth-century plantation houses have been documented.

The house at Comingtee Plantation was similar in construction (figure 7.12). According to Anne Simons Deas, the original Comingtee Plantation house consisted of a two-storied structure with a front and rear door but not a porch. This structure was later altered to include a two-story masonry structure with five bays and internal end chimneys on a high basement. Between 1810 and 1834, John Ball Jr. altered the structure further by adding a perpendicular two-storied wood frame along the side and rear of the masonry structure (Norton and Khan 2006:9).
In 2006, Kim Norton and Abbid Hussein Khan documented the condition of the historic Comingtee Plantation house (c. 1738) and the Stoke Rice Mill (1830) for the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources that also owned Bossis, Bonneau Ferry, The Hut, The Villa, Farmfield, Fishpond, and portions of Richmond and Comingtee Plantations. The Norton and Khan report (2006:32-50) included measured drawings, which were useful in estimating the size of other plantation houses along the East Branch. The most useful drawing (Norton and Khan 2006:41) was of the west side elevation, which indicated a three-foot high basement, a ten-foot high first floor, and an eight-foot eight-inch high portion of the second floor (figure 7.16). Using these measurements, the height of the observer at Limerick and Kensington Plantation houses is set at 5 meters to represent the observer on the second story and at Hyde Park Plantation is set at 2 meters to represent the observer on the first story.

A new viewshed from each planter-elite house was recalculated with recent Lidar DEM and clipped to a 1000-meter distance (Higuchi 1983). The resulting binary viewsheds were then combined together to produce an overlay that represents the visible areas within the panoptic plantation landscape (figure 7.17). Viewsheds assume the observer has a strong acuity of vision; however, because visual clarity decreases with distance, being able to see and to recognize what is seen are very different. For instance, psychology professor Geoffrey
Loftus (2005) argued that the average person could see another person’s head at a distance of five hundred feet (152.40 meters) although just as a blur. Beyond one hundred fifty meters, some degree of prior knowledge of the area or person is necessary unless a highly visible feature marks the area or person. For this particular analysis, planter-elite visibility is limited to a distance of one thousand-meter threshold from the plantation house. These buffers are not weighted according to the decrease of visible risk as the distance increases but rather are used for display purposes as an overlay over potential paths.

The 5-meter DEM, based on new Lidar data for Berkeley County, provides details not present in the 30-meter DEM. Although slope is recalculated using the new DEM, it is not included in the new cost surface because the relative levelness of the topography does not affect mobility. Hydrology costs are recalculated to eliminate wetlands and only account for water sources such as rivers, lakes, reservoirs, and streams. The only cost from the earlier model that is reapplied to the new model is soil because this factor is not affected by the new DEM. New costs, represented in figure 7.18, are chosen to prevent adversely inflating the cost surface with redundant data.

The cost distance analysis for the Group I enslaved settlements reveals low costs in close proximity of each settlement (figure 7.19). The cost of mobility away from the settlements increases the further one moves away from their
home settlement towards another settlement. One presumption could be that each settlement is located at a distance from each other to reduce the possibility of casual mingling among the enslaved laborers from various settlements.

It must be remembered when interpreting the model results that Least Cost Paths only predicts a path that would incur the least cost or effort. Even if the cost or effort is slightly higher, alternate paths are not identified. Therefore, model reveals paths that the enslaved laborer might have traveled rather than paths that were actually traveled. However, should be expected; visual comparisons can reveal potential paths that are similar as well as some that are quite different. For instance, in the study area slight changes in elevation can alter the location of paths and flat surfaces may produce more direct (straight) paths. Figures 7.20 to 7.25 present the visual results of the least cost path analysis from each enslaved laborer settlement in Group I. In each figure, there are two representations of the results. The image on the left represents the corresponding paths (shown as black lines); the image on the right represents the paths with an overlay of the 1000-meter viewshed (panoptic viewshed) from the planter-elite houses in Group I. Figure 7.26 presents the sum of all paths in various colors from each enslaved laborer settlement in Group I with its corresponding panoptic viewshed.
Analysis of the six enslaved laborer settlements moves from North to South in the following order: Tanner Road, Limerick Remote, and Limerick Core at Limerick Plantation; St. James settlement at St. James Plantation; Kensington Core at Kensington Plantation; and, finally, Hyde Park Core at Hyde Park.

**Tanner Road Settlement (figure 7.20)**

Since Tanner Road represents the northernmost enslaved laborer settlement, it follows that paths should lead South. For the most part, all paths follow a South to Southwest trajectory on the north side of the East Branch. The path offers one path to the Limerick Core settlement with multiple short paths along the way. This path forks mid-way to the right to offer a path to the other settlements. Just before the Limerick Core settlement another fork offers two paths; the right path leads to the Limerick Core settlement and Hyde Park settlement while the left path leads to another forked path to either St. James and Kensington settlements. Only the path to the Limerick Remote settlement avoids the panoptic viewshed. The path to the St. James settlement is subjected to the outer limits of the panoptic viewshed at three points. As expected, as one moves along paths towards the various plantation core settlements panoptic visibility increases. Basically, paths from the Tanner Road settlement are straightforward with one exception.
The exception is the circuitous path to the Hyde Park settlement at the southernmost area of the Group I plantations. This path follows the exact same trajectory to the Limerick Core settlement where it continues southeasterly across the East Branch to the south side of the river. Once outside the Group I panoptic viewshed the path continues southeasterly to the inland before turning south and then southwesterly to the East Branch River. The path continues southerly along the edge of the East Branch and turns southwesterly into the river and into the panoptic viewshed before turning northwesterly towards land and westerly to the Hyde Park settlement. This path begs the question: why such a circuitous and long route? In examining the panoptic viewshed overly, it appears that all other potential routes lay within the panoptic viewshed of one or more plantations. But, is the predicted path the best route from Tanner Road to Hyde Park? Not necessarily so, because the study area includes data for Group I plantations only, it does not take into consideration the risks and/or costs from the neighboring plantations in Groups IV and V (see figures 6.8 and 6.9). Additionally, visibility within the panoptic viewshed increases in areas near the East Branch when visibility overlaps from more than one plantation house (see figure 7.17). Therefore, relying on solely on information from this analysis, there is a high probability of error. In this case, additional data would prove the higher cost of this path.
Limerick Remote Settlement (figure 7.21)

The Limerick Remote represents the westernmost enslaved laborer settlement at Limerick Plantation. As the second most northern settlement, one path should lead north while all other paths should lead South. With the exception of the northward path to Tanner Road, paths from the Limerick Remote settlement follow a South to Southwest trajectory similar to the paths from Tanner Road on the north side of the East Branch. In particular, the path to the Limerick and Kensington core settlements matches the Tanner Road path before the path forks to each settlement. Further, the path to the Hyde Park settlement follows the exact circuitous path as the Tanner Road path to Hyde Park. A stark difference appears in the southwest path to the St. James settlement and the northeast path to Tanner Road settlement. Both of these paths are straight line paths and are completely outside the panoptic viewshed.

Limerick Core Settlement (figure 7.22)

The Limerick Core settlement is the northernmost enslaved laborer settlement on the East Branch River and the southernmost settlement at Limerick Plantation. With its location on the northern shores of the East Branch, paths should begin in the panoptic viewshed and lead north and west; however, the majority of the paths lead in a South, Southwest, West, and Northwest trajectory. The northwestern path from the Limerick Core to the Limerick Remote
settlement follows the same trajectory as the path from the opposite direction. Along the way the path forks northerly to the Tanner Road settlement; however, the fork occurs at a point where the path from Tanner Road settlement to the Limerick Core settlement and the path from the Limerick Remote settlement to the Limerick Core settlement would meet then continues along the same trajectory as the Tanner Road path in the opposite direction. Once again, the path to the Hyde Park settlement follows exactly the same trajectory as the paths from the Tanner Road settlement and the Limerick Remote settlement to the Hyde Park settlement.

There are two notable exceptions in three the paths from the Limerick Core settlement. First, the path to the Kensington Core settlement is a straight line with some areas that are not subjected to the panoptic viewshed. Second, the path to the St. James settlement initially follows a northwest trajectory before it meets with and follows the path from the Tanner Road to the St. James settlement. Once these two paths meet, the impact of the panoptic viewshed is very limited.

**St. James Settlement (figure 7.23)**

The St. James settlement represents the westernmost enslaved laborer settlement and the only plantation without a planter-elite house in Group I. As the western most settlement, path should lead Northeast, East and South;
however, the majority of the paths lead East, Southeast, South, and Southeast. Because there is no planter-elite house at this site, the enslaved laborer settlement is not subjected to the panoptic viewshed until the paths enter the panoptic viewshed at Limerick, Kensington, and Hyde Park Plantations. Three paths lead from the settlement to other settlements. First, with only a slight bend in the path closest to the St. James settlement, the path’s trajectory towards the Limerick Remote settlement is a straight line similar to the path from the opposite direction and is completely outside the panoptic viewshed. Second, a path leads to the Limerick Core settlement and is almost similar to the path from the Limerick Core settlement to the St. James settlement; however, the path forks before the Limerick Core settlement to meet at a northern point above the Limerick core on the path from the Limerick Core settlement to the Tanner Road settlement. Third, a straight line path leads to the Kensington Core settlement. This same road forks southwardly towards the Hyde Park settlement on the virtually same path from the opposite direction.

**Kensington Core Settlement (figure 7.24)**

The Kensington Core settlement is the second northernmost enslaved laborer settlement on the East Branch River and the only settlement at Kensington Plantation. Similar to the Limerick Core settlement’s location on the northern shores of the East Branch, paths should begin in the panoptic viewshed and lead
north, west, and south as shown in figure 7.24. All paths are located on the north side of the East Branch River and begin within the panoptic viewshed. Only two paths lead from the Kensington Core settlement; one leads in a northwest straight line to the St. James settlement and the other leads easterly towards the East Branch River where it splits into either a northward path towards the Limerick Core settlement, the Limerick Remote settlement, and the Tanner Road settlement or a southward path to the Hyde Park settlement. The northward path moves along the river to a point where it would meet the path from the Limerick Core settlement to the Kensington Core settlement. At this point there is a fork with a westward turn for a short distance before it turns northward, which is a portion of the path from Limerick Remote settlement to the Kensington Core settlement. From this point the path follows the path from the Limerick Remote settlement. Along the way, the path forks northward towards the Tanner Road settlement at the same point path from the Limerick core settlement forks towards the Tanner Road settlement. The majority of all paths from the Kensington core settlement are subjected to the panoptic viewshed except the paths beyond the fork to the Limerick Remote and Tanner Road settlements as well as a short portion of the path near the St. James settlement.
Hyde Park Settlement (figure 7.25)

The Hyde Park settlement is the southernmost enslaved laborer settlement in Group I on the East Branch River. As with the other settlements located on the northern shores of the East Branch, paths should begin in the panoptic viewshed and lead north and west; however, the majority of the paths lead in a South, Southwest, West, Northeast and North trajectory. Two paths originate from the Hyde Park settlement; one is north towards Kensington Core and St. James settlements and the other is the circuitous eastern, southern, northeastern trajectory that crosses the East Branch River to the plantations on the south side of the river then north to the Limerick Core settlement. The path to the Kensington settlement follows the same trajectory as the path from the Kensington settlement in the opposite direction. At a point where this path turns eastward towards the river, it forks to the northwest and eventually joins with the path from the Kensington Core settlement to the St. James settlement. The circuitous path to the Limerick Core settlement continues to follow the same paths from the Limerick Core settlements to both the Limerick Remote and the Tanner Road settlements. As mentioned previously, the path through the plantations on the south side of the river are not feasible.

In figure 7.26, paths for all the Group I enslaved laborer settlements is shown on the Ferguson/Babson map (left) and on the Lidar DEM (right) with the
panoptic viewshed. By displaying all paths together, a visual representation of potential paths reveals how similar the majority of paths may have been for enslaved laborer mobility between and among the settlements at the plantations in Group I. For the majority of the paths, the most cost effective paths are somewhat different than a simple straight line path between neighboring settlements. Yet these same paths are clearly available from several settlements. The exceptions are the three paths between Tanner Road, Kensington, and Hyde Park that traverse the East Branch River and the plantations on the south side of said river. In this case, it was least costly to cross the river, travel through other plantations, and then cross the river again. Although river travel is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it may be possible that travel along and/or over waterways enhanced mobility. However, earlier panoptic viewshed analysis of both sides of the East Branch at the regional scale reveals that travel along this path would be highly unlikely in avoidance of surveillance.

Conclusion

In this chapter I utilize LCP analysis to model potential mobility by the enslaved laborers to address cognitive questions about the plantation landscape. Where are the potential paths or trails utilized by enslaved laborers for rituals and activities that are out of sight of the planter-elite’s perceived structure of surveillance and control?
Based on the literature, expected potential mobility towards the periphery (plantation boundaries) of the East Branch community is confirmed. At the regional scale and with an outwardly-focused mobility hypothesis, the least cost path analysis produced potential paths from the enslaved laborer settlements that are short in distance with the exception of the enslaved laborer settlements on the south side of the East Branch that exhibit potential paths over much greater distances toward the eastern plantation boundaries.

Interestingly, the regional LCP reveals several patterns of potential mobility: (1) either inward towards the East Branch or (2) outward from the East Branch, or (3) a combination of both. Firstly, the model suggests that potential mobility for enslaved laborers at settlements located near the East Branch focuses inward towards the river or across the river to settlements located on the opposite side of the East Branch. Core enslaved laborer settlements that exhibit this pattern are at Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, Bossis, Farmfield, Richmond, and Blessing Plantations.

Secondly, the model suggests that potential paths leading outward towards the boundaries occurs from the enslaved laborer settlements not located in the river corridor. For example, the remote settlements at the plantation boundaries near the western edge of the study area as well as the two remote enslaved laborer settlements at Limerick Plantation orient towards the western
boundary and Little Hell Hole Bay, respectively. A similar pattern exists at the Spring Hill Plantation settlement oriented outward towards the plantation boundaries at eastern edge of the study area. This pattern might suggest a higher potential of activities in the spaces between the neighboring plantations on the edges of the study area and the East Branch plantations. The LCP suggests potential paths from the Tanner Road settlement at Limerick Plantation lead outward in an east-southeast direction away from the other Limerick settlements. Near the southern edge of the study area, the LCP suggests only an outward trajectory from the Akinfield settlement toward the Cooper River whereas the LCP suggests an outward trajectory from Moreland settlement towards the Cooper River and towards possibly potential liminal space near neighboring plantations beyond the edge of the study area.

Thirdly, the model suggests that potential mobility is available in both directions, inward toward the East Branch and outward toward neighboring plantations beyond the edge of the study area or the Cooper River. This pattern is suggested at Fish Pond towards neighboring plantations beyond the edge of the study area and at Comingtee and Hegan Plantations towards the Cooper River.

The most surprising result of the regional LCP is the lack of any potential paths from the St. James enslaved laborer settlement. This pattern is in stark
contrast to the connectivity analysis, which indicates direct connections to the core enslaved settlements at both Limerick Plantation and Kensington Plantation. Perhaps, moderate to severe soil trafficability and the forested wetlands created conditions that isolated this settlement. St. James should prove to be a site rich archaeological remains, therefore, I recommend that future excavations should be undertaken here.

The regional LCP analysis failed to adequately address mobility between enslaved laborer settlements. Therefore, I created another LCP analysis, focused on mobility between the settlements, as a case study that includes visibility (panoptic viewshed) as a factor. The case study LCP reveals additional patterns of potential mobility within the study area at a smaller scale. First, the case study countered the notion that paths from enslaved laborers settlements located near the East Branch are singularly focused toward the East Branch. Of the Group I plantations included in this presumption, only the Hyde Park settlement exhibits potential paths that might have crossed the East Branch River. Based on the panoptic viewsheds analyzed in chapter six, it is highly unlikely that these paths would be viable. More analysis is needed at the Group level of other East Branch plantations to determine the potentiality of such paths.

Next, the regional LCP analysis indicates that paths from the Limerick Remote settlement and the Tanner Road settlement are oriented westerly
towards the edge of the study area. The case study LCP analysis suggests the possibility of paths between these communities as well as paths with the St. James settlement that are completely outside the realm of the panoptic viewshed. Perhaps there was no need for these enslaved laborers to move towards the plantation boundaries or edges of the study area when engaging in activities of their own making. These areas should receive additional focused research in the future.

Also, the case study LCP contradicted the notion of isolation at the St. James settlement. As a matter of interest, this LCP analysis supported the regional connectivity analysis by linking the St. James settlement to other enslaved laborer communities within Group I plantations. Two of three possible paths directly connect St. James to (1) the Limerick Remote settlement outside of the panoptic viewshed, and (2) the Kensington Core settlement, albeit fifty percent of the path is within the panoptic viewshed. The fact that the St. James settlement is located at a distance from the panoptic viewshed increases its candidacy for future archaeological investigation.

When applying the panoptic plantation theory, it becomes apparent that potential paths within the river corridor and plantation core would come under the direct scrutiny of the planter-elite class. One of the implications of the regional LCP analysis results is that mobility towards the river may have been
less costly from some of enslaved laborer settlements within the river corridor; however, mobility within the corridor comes with high risk of planter-elite surveillance.

The case study combined of results of the VA and LCP models to address the mobility of enslaved laborers from one settlement to another within a Group of plantations that operated under the ownership of the same family for several decades. By combining the two models, this dissertation adds to the ongoing discussion of how archaeologists can locate sites of possible enslaved laborer activity outside the realm of the plantation core.
Table 7.1 Slope Reclassification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Topography/Regular Surface</th>
<th>Slope Percentage</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depressional to Level</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Gently Sloping</td>
<td>0.51 – 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gently Sloping</td>
<td>2.1 – 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Sloping</td>
<td>5.1 – 9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Sloping</td>
<td>9.1 – 15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steeply Sloping</td>
<td>15.1 – 30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Steeply Sloping</td>
<td>30.1 – 60</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Sloping</td>
<td>&gt;60.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 Soil Reclassification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Drainage</th>
<th>Trail Suitability</th>
<th>Reclassification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Unavailable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3 Land Use/Hydrology Reclassification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Dataset</th>
<th>Hydrology Dataset</th>
<th>Reclassification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forested Wetland</td>
<td>Forested Wetland</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Forested Wetland</td>
<td>Non-Forested Wetland</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Water</td>
<td>Lake/Pond</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4 Cost Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Depressional to Level</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Gently Sloping</td>
<td>0.51 – 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gently Sloping</td>
<td>2.1 – 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Unavailable</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Forested Wetland</td>
<td>Forested Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Non-forested Wetland</td>
<td>Non-forested Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Water</td>
<td>Lake/Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.5 Back Link Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Link Values</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 7 8</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>17.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 0 1</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>13.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 2</td>
<td>2257</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Link Values</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>12.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Link Values</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Link Values</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.1 Slope Reclassifications
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Figure 7.3 Landuse Reclassification and Hydrology Reclassification
Figure 7.4 Surface Costs
Figure 7.5 Euclidean Distance
Figure 7.6 Cost Distance
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Figure 7.8 Cost Back Link
Figure 7.9 Least Cost Paths: (A) towards the periphery, (B) towards the river, and (C) combined paths
Figure 7.10 Enslaved Laborer Least Cost Connectivity
Figure 7.11 Least Cost Paths on cost surfaces: (A) Slope, (B) Soil Suitability, (C) Hydrology, and (D) Hypothetical Landuse
Figure 7.12 Comingtee House, date unknown (Source: Deas 1909)
Figure 7.13 Limerick House in 1900 (Source: Deas 1909)
Figure 7.14 Kensington House 1900 (Source: Deas 1909)
Figure 7.15 Hyde Park House, date unknown
Figure 7.16 Drawing of Comingtee Plantation (Source: Norton and Khan 2006)
Figure 7.17 Group I Plantation Panoptic Viewshed showing view from one planter-elite house (pink), two planter-elite houses (dark pink), and three planter-elite houses (red).
Figure 7.18 Costs with 5 meter Lidar (left) and with the Panoptic Viewshed (right). Location of enslaved laborer settlements shown as red triangle.
Figure 7.19 Group I Enslaved Laborer Cost Distance from each settlement representing low (yellow) to high (pink) cost or effort
Figure 7.20 Paths (black line) and Panoptic Viewshed (pink) from Tanner Road Settlement
Figure 7.21 Paths (black lines) and Panoptic Viewshed (pink) from Limerick Remote Settlement
Figure 7.22 Paths (black lines) and Panoptic Viewshed (pink) from Limerick Core Settlement
Figure 7.23 Paths (black lines) and Panoptic Viewshed (pink) from St. James Settlement
Figure 7.24 Paths (black lines) and Panoptic Viewshed (pink) from Kensington Core Settlement
Figure 7.25 Paths (black lines) and Panoptic Viewshed (pink) from Hyde Park Settlement
Figure 7.26 Paths (lines in various colors) and Panoptic Viewshed (pink) from all Group I settlements shown over Ferguson/Babson map (left) and over 5 meter Lidar DEM (right)
CHAPTER EIGHT
CONCLUSION

Introduction

In this chapter I summarize the dissertation, discuss the findings and contributions, point out limitations of the current work, and outline directions for future research. The overarching research question was to what extent and where did the enslaved laborers create potential pathways to avoid the perceived planter-elite panoptic plantation landscape on plantations at the East Branch of the Cooper River? In order to examine this problem, a mixed methods design was required at the regional scale of analysis to permit cross-site patterns that support the argument that the panoptic plantation theory applies in a close-knit kin-based community that operated as a collective unit rather than as individual plantations. Ultimately, I argue that cognitive predictive models, as a tool, assist historical archaeologists to identify potential locations for future archaeological investigations of enslaved laborers’ rituals and/or activities that were out-of-sight of the planter-elites’ perceived structure of surveillance and control.
Discussion

In this section, I synthesize the findings from the quantitative and qualitative methodology to answer the dissertation research sub-questions. Using a mixed methods design, I found that the panoptic plantation theory applies at the regional scale to several plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River and that the cognitive predictive model suggests potential pathways that enslaved laborers created to avoid planter-elite surveillance and control.

The qualitative information described in chapters two to four addressed the natural, social, and cultural landscapes of the plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River. As a reminder, I repeat the specific research sub-questions for the qualitative methodology.

5. Who were the planter-elites, mixed-race elites, mulattoes, and enslaved African and African-Americans laborers living on plantations in the East Branch of the Cooper River from initial settlement in the late 1600s to approximately 1822?

6. What were the identifying characteristics of each group in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that structured ideologies and perceptions of the East Branch plantation landscape?
7. What strategies did the planter-elite develop to maintain their elite ideology and perceptions of the East Branch plantation landscape?

8. What were the implications of the American Revolution and the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy that affected planter-elites’ and enslaved laborers’ ideologies and perceptions of the East Branch plantation landscapes?

The main findings of these sub-questions are chapter specific and I summarize each within the respective chapters. One of the themes to emerge was the formation of a close kin-based tight-knit community in the East Branch that began with the initial settlement of an ‘open’ community in the late 1600s and transitioned by the third generation into a completely ‘closed’ community. Out of the ‘open’ community, composed of English, French Huguenots, Scots, Barbadians, and enslaved laborers from West and West-Central Africa, emerged two highly selective and cohesive societies based on kinship relationships: an Anglicized planter-elite society and an Africanized enslaved laborer society. The uniqueness of this ‘closed’ community, based on generations of intermarriage and self-isolation, resulted in a collective identity not only among the planter-elites but also among the enslaved laborers. The ‘close’ aspect of the East Branch community was evidenced by the brief tenure of the European-African Holman
family and their enslaved laborers who were denied community membership in the East Branch.

Another theme that emerged was that close geographical proximity to each other and self-isolation enabled the planter-elites to rely upon relatives to aide them not only in the operations of their plantations but also in the surveillance and control of their enslaved laborers. As a consequence of close geographical proximity and isolation, the enslaved laborers created a strong, stable community, which continues into the twenty-first century. On the one hand, placing the East Branch plantations within the panoptic plantation model revealed a planter-elite community that shared surveillance and control over the enslaved laborer population. On the other hand, the panoptic plantation model also revealed an enslaved laborer community that created their own places and spaces where they lived and worked.

Before the American Revolution, East Branch planter-elites reflected the larger planter-elite society who viewed themselves foremost as citizens of England. Their carefully established sense of identity with England left the planter-elite class uncertain about their future in the new nation. Over the next few decades, several incidents on the national area threatened the carefully subscribed social and racial hierarchy created by Lowcountry planter-elites. East Branch planter-elites were more concerned with reestablishing their pre-War
economic status by replenishing their enslaved laborer population and maintaining their close-knit kin-based status quo. As the planter-elite struggled to maintain their power and privilege the 1822 Denmark Vesey Conspiracy reintroduced both insecurity and social uncertainty. Therefore, the American Revolution and the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy represent definitive markers in terms of power, resistance, and control on East Branch rice plantations.

As outlined in chapter five, I employed cognitive predictive models in a two-part quantitative methodology to investigate the application of the panoptic plantation model and mobility in the East Branch community. The research sub-questions in the second part of the quantitative method, presented in chapter seven, were formulated on the results of the first part of the quantitative method, presented in chapter six. The specific research sub-questions for the first part of the quantitative methodology were:

5. To what extent was visibility from the centerline of the East Branch of the Cooper River?

6. To what extent was intervisibility from the planter-elites’ houses at plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River?

7. To what extent was intervisibility from the enslaved laborers’ settlements at plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River?
8. What are the potential areas of potential planter-elite surveillance and control over the enslaved laborer settlements?

The specific research sub-questions for the second part of the quantitative methodology were:

3. What cost factors influence mobility through the natural landscape?

4. Based on the identified cost factors, where are the potential paths, corridors or networks that the enslaved laborers may have used to move through the actual plantation landscape and the perceived panoptic plantation landscape?

Several patterns emerged from my analysis of the panoptic plantation model and mobility on the East Branch plantations. First, and foremost, the location of the planter-elites’ houses at the majority of the plantations along the East Branch of the Cooper River were located within close proximity of the centerline of the river, which focused surveillance and control primarily towards either the East Branch of the Cooper River, the Cooper River, or French Quarter Creek. As a riverine-based community, this finding suggests that both the enslaved laborer settlements located in the plantation core and the planter-elite houses were subjected to high levels of reciprocal surveillance; however, visibility did not inhibit potential enslaved laborer mobility. This finding suggests that although the higher level of surveillance should discourage
mobility, it is possible that proximity to the river served as a strong motivational factor for enslaved laborer mobility ‘right under the noses’ of the planter-elite.

Secondly, upon closer examination of grouped plantations, visibility patterns and surveillance differed between the two groups. The visibility model revealed higher levels of planter-elite visibility along the East Branch from plantations located beyond French Quarter Creek towards the headwaters of the East Branch but revealed higher levels of enslaved laborer visibility along the East Branch from French Quarter Creek towards the ‘T’ at the junction with the Cooper River; however, there was little correlation with potential enslaved laborer pathways. In fact, potential enslaved laborer mobility on the north side of the East Branch moved in either or both directions towards the East Branch and/or towards the boundaries of the study area. Thirdly, the findings of the least cost analysis model at the regional level suggested that despite a high level of planter-elite surveillance along the East Branch, mobility towards the study area boundaries extended from some enslaved laborers settlements within the surveillance area. In some cases, enslaved laborers could have traveled along several potential paths over long distances to the periphery. This finding supported the qualitative documentation that suggested enslaved laborers participated in activities/rituals on the periphery of the plantation. The most interesting finding was that the models suggested that potential mobility for
enslaved laborers were short distances of travel whether the path was towards the river or towards the periphery.

Fourthly, the case study of enslaved laborer mobility from settlements in Group I (Limerick, Kensington, Hyde Park, St. James, and Midway Plantations) suggests potential paths might have been possible from one or more settlements that avoided the panoptic viewshed of the planter-elites. For example, the regional least cost path model suggested that settlement at St. James Plantation was isolated from other settlements. However, in the case study, the least cost path model identified three potential paths with connections to the Limerick remote settlement, the Kensington core settlement and the Limerick core settlement. The most interesting finding was the circuitous paths between the Hyde Park settlement and the three settlements at Limerick Plantation that avoided the Group I panoptic viewshed by crossing the East Branch of the Cooper River. With the addition of the panoptic viewsheds from the planter-elite houses located across the river, the trajectory of these paths should change. Overall, the quantitative method revealed that enslaved laborers may have created potential pathways that worked to their advantage within the panoptic plantation landscape.
Theoretical Implications

Because of the multidisciplinary nature of this dissertation, I incorporated theories and methods about the understanding of power relations and neighbor-assisted surveillances between planter-elites and enslaved laborers that are based in the disciplines of anthropology, geography, historical archaeology, and history. Not only does my dissertation contribute to the broad paradigm of landscape archaeology, plantation archaeology, and the panoptic plantation theory, but it also contributes to emerging theories in cognitive predictive modeling.

This dissertation contributes significantly to current historical archaeology literature that examines panoptic plantations as well as contributes to underdeveloped research focusing on enslaved laborer mobility. By examining the panoptic plantation theory from the viewpoint of the enslaved laborer, I suggest that this dissertation contributes to and broaden the work begun by other scholars who are centering studies on the enslaved laborers rather than the planter-elites (Bates et al. 2016; Chenoweth et al. 2016; Delle 2016; Ellis and Ginsberg 2010; Kaye 2007). Further, I suggest that centering the enslaved laborers at the core within the panoptic plantation approach challenges scholars to view enslaved laborers as creators of their own cognitive landscape rather than victims of the planter-elites’ cognitive landscape. This viewpoint permits
historical archaeologists to challenge the notion that enslaved laborers were merely passive victims of a hegemonic panoptic plantation system thought to be beyond their control. To the contrary, I suggest that the enslaved laborers’ cognitive understanding of the plantation landscape informed their ‘active’ mobility through the landscape and created opportunities to strengthen their communities.

Quantitatively, this dissertation contributes to an increasing number of historical archaeology studies that examine settlement and plantation archeology using Geographic Information Systems (Whitley 2003, 2005, 2008). Historical archaeologist Thomas Whitley’s cognitive predictive model and his employment of Geographic Information Systems greatly influenced my methodological choices. However, few historical archaeologists fully incorporate Geographic Information Systems into their studies (González-Tennant 2016). Although historical archaeologists have been employing visibility analysis in plantation archeology (Bates 2007; Delle 1998, 1999; La Kose 2004; Whitley 2002, 2008), this dissertation links visibility studies with the implementation of least cost analysis, a relatively new methodology in historical archaeology. As part of the historical archaeologist’s toolkit, Geographic Information Systems offers a methodology to query and investigate qualitative and quantitative research questions focusing on past perceptions of the landscape.
Limitations of Study

My analysis has concentrated on the methodological results addressing the potential mobility of enslaved laborers through the panoptic plantation landscape at the regional scale. Using Geographic Information Systems cannot tell us exactly where archaeological evidence will be found; however, this methodology helps historical archaeologists to predict potential archaeological sites for future investigation. There were two features of the least cost path analysis that affected the quality of the findings. First, I restricted the cost surface criteria to one weighted combination rather than generating various combinations of the variables. Second, I made the decision to create end points along the centerline of the river and along the periphery of the study area. Both decisions limited the analytical possibilities of potential paths in the study area. For example, it is possible that another variation of the weighted criteria may have produced paths in different locations. Additionally, by focusing the end points for the least cost path analysis on the East Branch centerline and the boundaries of the study area, I did not account for pathways between plantations. This choice was based two assumptions that enslaved laborer mobility would be either towards the periphery or towards the river. Third, the results of the case study of the settlements in Group I reveal the necessity to expand the analysis beyond a small group of plantations within a community.
The choices I made evidentially introduced some bias into the results. Unfortunately, my findings should not be taken as evidence of actual pathways or archaeological evidence; instead, my findings provide an opening for future historical archaeologists to further examine the potential of enslaved laborer mobility within the context of the panoptic plantation.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

I think possible areas for future research should include continued archival research for plats, deeds, and other documentation to add to rich documentation of the East Branch landscape. One avenue for further study is to refine the visibility analysis of the panoptic plantation theory with the incorporation of 3D modeling of structures and vegetation. Another avenue for future study would be to incorporate the location and role of overseers.

This study focused on one close-knit kin-based rice plantation community and the enslaved laborers who worked under the task system. Can historical archaeologists apply this model in other regions? I suggest that the unique ‘closed’ community of East Branch may exist in other locales. If so, this dissertation serves as a model to examine similar phenomenon. I suggest that historical archaeologists who examine the role of enslaved laborers with the panoptic plantation landscape should consider examining enslaved laborer mobility at various scales of inquiry. The potential for future research into
plantation archaeology might usefully focus on how enslaved laborer mobility outside of the plantation core manifested in other plantation contexts.

Finally, as a next step, future historical archaeologists can take this model of the East Branch as a layout for developing an archaeological survey. In figure 8.1, the regional least cost paths and the case study least cost paths from each Group I enslaved settlement are juxtaposed over modern parcel data. As shown, most of the historic plantations remain intact with few alterations and the possibility exists for future excavation.

Conclusion

My study of the East Branch plantations offers suggestive evidence for the potential mobility of enslaved laborers within the context of the panoptic plantation model. Using a mixed method design, this dissertation supports the argument that enslaved laborers may have created potential paths to avoid the perceived planter-elite panoptic plantation landscape on plantations at the East Branch of the Cooper River. Furthermore, this dissertation supports scholarly qualitative evidence about how enslaved laborers cognitively viewed and intimately knew the landscape around them. When the enslaved laborer is at the center of inquiry, the discussion of plantation landscapes shifts from spaces of oppression to spaces of liberty. If the tentative conclusions of my study are confirmed by the repositioning of the enslaved laborer then there will be a case
for other scholars and historical archaeologists to reevaluate the way plantation archaeology is studied.
Least Cost Paths over Modern Parcels

Figure 8.1 Least Cost Paths over Modern Parcels
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives and Manuscripts

Berkeley County Historical Society

Charleston County Public Library
  Wills and Miscellaneous Records
  State Plat Collection from South Carolina Archives

Charleston County Register of Mesne Conveyance

Duke University
  John Ball, Sr. and Jr. Papers
  Estate of Ed Tanner Account Book

Historic Charleston Foundation
  Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, Research File
  Pompion Hill Chapel, Berkeley County, Research File
  Kensington Plantation, Berkeley County, Research File
  Richmond Plantation, Berkeley County, Research File

Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
  Henry Laurens Papers

Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC
  Henry Laurens Papers

London Church History 1892

McGregor Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
  Henry Laurens Papers

New York Historical Society, New York, NY
  Henry Laurens Papers
  Letter from Godfrey to Vernons, April 8, 1756
Negro Conspiracy, Parish Transcripts
Slavery Manuscripts, Box VI

New York Public Library, New York, NY
Henry Laurens Papers

Race & Slavery Petitions Project
1791  #11379101, To the Honorable the President & the Members of the Senate of South Carolina, SCDAH, 1791 #151, frames 754-56, Reel #2.
1791  #11379102, To the Honorable the President & the Members of the Senate of South Carolina, SCDAH, 1791 #123, frames 754-56, Reel #2, 13 January 1791.
1803  #21380303, To the Honorable Hugh Rutledge and William Marshall Esquires Judges of the Court of Equity, SCDAH, Records of the Equity Court, Bills, 1803-15, #48, reel D1267, 14 January 1803.
1814  #21381421, To the Honorable Henry Wm DeSaussure, Theodore Gaillard, Thomas Waties, William D. James & Waddy Thompson, Esquires, Judges of the Honorable Court of Equity of the State Aforesaid, SCDAH, Records of the Equity Court, Bills, 1814-roll 57, #120, reel D1268, June 30, 1814.

South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC
1791 Legislative Record, Petition of John Holman to the South Carolina General Assembly, dated 3 October 1791.

South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, SC
Agnes Leland Baldwin Research Papers, 1966-1982
Ball Family Papers
Blessing Plantation, dated November 22, 1954, File 30-15-4
DeSaussure Family Papers, 1716-1938
Henry Laurens Papers
Ravenel Family Papers, 1776-1933
Timothy Ford Papers, 1776-1830

South Caroliniana, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC
Ball and Gilchrist Papers, #14226

Southern Historical Collection, Louis Round Wilson Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC
John Ball and Keating Simons Ball Books, 1779-1911
William J. Ball Books, 1804-1890
“Take heed how ye hear,’ A sermon preached in the Parish of St. Philip Charles-Town in South Carolina on Sunday the 13th of July 1740: with a preface, containing remarks on Mr. Whitfield’s journal” by Alexander Garden, M.A. Rector of Said Parish.

Databases
National Land Cover Database
Web Soil Survey
United States Environmental Protection Agency
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
United States Geological Survey

Legislative Acts
Charter of Carolina, 1665
Minutes of the Council in the Assembly
South Carolina Act #348
South Carolina Act of 1690
South Carolina Act of 1707
South Carolina Act of 1740, #670
South Carolina Act of 1797
South Carolina Concurrent Resolutions
South Carolina Public Laws
South Carolina Records
South Carolina Statutes

Maps
Ferguson, Leland G. and David W. Babson
1986 A Map of Plantations and Properties on the Eastern Branch of the Cooper River, Berkeley County, South Carolina, 1780-1825, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Gaillard, Joseph P.

Green, Thomas
1790 Plat of Windsor Plantation, St. Thomas Parish, South Carolina.
Hardwick, John
1797 Plan of Limerick: A Plantation Belonging to Elias Ball, Esquire, etc., McCrady Plats #1541, South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

McCrady, John Plat Collection
1808 Plat of Jericho Plantation. John Ball, Plan of a Tract of Land containing 4,408 acres, Bethera, South Carolina.

Moll, Herman
1731 A new and exact map of the dominions of the King of Great Britain on ye continent of North America, containing Newfoundland, New Scotland, New England, New York, New Jersey, Pensilvania, Maryland, Virginia and Carolina.

Pinckney, R.Q.
1834 Plat of Irish Town, Lot 1 for Edward Harleston.

1834 Plat of Irish Town, Lot 2 for Heirs of William Harleston.

Purcell, Joseph
1700 Plat of Irishtown for Andrew Hasell.

1773 Plan of Fishbrook Plantation belonging to Robert Quash, esq’ situated at the head of the south fork of Cooper River in St. Thomas Berkeley County and Province of South Carolina containing in the whole 2303 acres from a survey taken 1773.

1786 A Plan Exhibiting the Shape and Form of the Body of Land Called Limerick, etc., Ball Family Papers, University of South Carolina.

1788 Irishtown for Andrew Hasell, South Carolina Historical Society, file #32-32-05.

Simons and Mayrant
1906 Lands owned by Thomas Deavington [sic] and Brindely [sic], South Carolina Historical Society, file #32-88-03.

1906 Plat of Cherry and Cedar Hill.

Smith, H.A.M. (South Carolina Historical Society Collection)
1810 Sketch of Jericho Plantation.

1810 Sketch of Silk Hope Plantation for Manigault.


United States Department of Agriculture

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service
1993 Topographic Maps from the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service cartographic database online. NAD83, 1,000m tics, UTM 17, 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale for Huger, Cordesville, Kittredge, Bethera Quadrants.

United States Department of Commerce

Newspapers and Periodicals

Charles Town Gazette
South Carolina Gazette
South Carolina Historical Magazine
Southern Patriot
Whitehall Evening Post
Articles, Books, Dissertations, and Reports

Adams, Natalie
1990 “Early African-American Domestic Architecture from Berkeley County, South,” Master’s Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Affleck, Richard M.

1990 “Power and Space: Settlement Pattern Change at Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina,” Master’s Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Agha, Andrew and Charles E. Philips, Jr.

Alderson, Robert J.

Alston, Lee J. and Morton Owen Schapiro

Anderson, James R., Ernest E. Hardy, John T. Roach, and Richard E. Witmer

Anonymous
1904 Limerick Plantation, Abstract of title to all that plantation or tract of land containing four thousand two hundred and eighteen acres known as Limerick Plantation, Berkeley County Courthouse, Moncks Corner, South Carolina, manuscript.

Anthony, Carl

Anzilotti, Cara


Armitage, David

Armstrong, Douglas V, and Kenneth G. Kelly

Ashby, Wayne
https://sites.google.com/site/knudsenconnection/Home/ashby-ancestry

Aston, M.

Babson, David W.


508


Bacot, Thomas W.

1922  “Abstract of the Title of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina to the Site of the Old Huguenot Church and Churchyard of Orange Quarter (St. Denis),” *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina*, 27:26-56.

Bailey, Mary

Bailey, N. Louise, Mary L. Morgan, and Carolyn R. Taylor

Baird, Charles Washington
1885  *Huguenot Emigration to America* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co.).

Ball, Edward


Ball, Lydia C.


Barile, Kerry


Barnes, Trevor J. and James S. Duncan, editors

Barnes, Jodi

Barnes, Jodi and Carl Steen

Barnwell, Joseph W., editor

Barr, William B.
1996  Strawberry Ferry (38BK1723) and Childsbury Towne (38BK1750): A Socio-Economic Enterprise on the Western Branch of the Cooper River, St. John’s Parish, Berkeley, South Carolina. Research MSS Series Book 208.
Bartram, William
1791  *Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida, the Cherokee Country, the Extensive Territory of the Muscogulges or Creek Confederacy, and the Country of the Choctaws, Containing an Account of the Soil and Natural Productions of those Regions, together with Observations on the Manners of the Indians* (Philadelphia: James and Johnson). Electronic edition.

Bates, Lynsey A.

Bates, Lynsey A., John M. Chenoweth and James A. Delle

Bates, Susan Baldwin and Harriott Cheves Leland

Beck, Monica L.

Bell, Kirstie, Kevin Haggerty, and David Lyon, editors

Bentham, Jeremy
1791  *Panopticon; or, the Inspection House* (London).

Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Regional Planning Council
1972  “Historic Preservation Plan” (Charleston, South Carolina).

Berlin, Ira
Binford, Lewis R.


1972 An Archaeological Perspective (Seminar Press).


Bolton, Charles Knowles

Bongie, Chris, translator and editor
2014 The Colonial System Unveiled by Baron de Vasley (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press).

Bourdieu, Pierre

Bowes, Frederick P.

Bowden, Allie Goodwin Myrick

Brandt, R., B.J. Groenewoudt, and Kenneth L. Kvamme
Branton, Nicole

Brewster, Lawrence Fay

Brockington and Associates, Inc.
1996 Data Recovery Investigations at 38BK1731 NUCOR Steel Company’s Hagan Plantation Tract Berkeley County, South Carolina (Crawfordville, IN: Nucor Steel Company).

Brockington, Eric and Charles F. Philips Jr.

Broun, Robert J.
1971 “History of the Broun Family and Related Families.”

Broüin, Thomas L.
“The Ball, Conway, Gaskins, McAdams, and Other Kindred of William and Janetta Broüin of Northern Neck, Virginia,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 20:60-64.

Brown, Ras Michael

Burns, Gwendolyn, A. Kem Fronabarger, and Thomas G. Whitley
Burroughs, Ben
2005  “Waites Island,” Burroughs and Chapin Center for Marine and Wetland Studies, Coastal Carolina University.

Butler, Nic

2013  “‘Like an Electric Shock’: Charleston during the War of 1812,” War of 1812 Symposium, The Citadel, February 9, 2013, C-SPAN.

Byra, Patti L.
1996  “The Contextual Meaning of the 1830s Landscape at Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina, Master’s Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Cable, John S.

Cable, John S., G. Ishmael Williams, Mary Beth Reed, and J.W. Joseph

Camp, Stephanie M.H.

Campbell, James T.

Carlson, David R. and Amy Jordan
Carlisle, B.  

Carney, Judith A.  

Castree, Noel and Bruce Braun, editors  

Chaplin, Joyce E.  

Chapman, Charles S.  

Chapman, Henry  
2006  Landscape Archaeology and GIS (Briscombe Port, Gloucestershire: Tempus).

Chenoweth, John M., James A. Delle, and Lynsey A. Bates  

Chidester, Robert C.  

Childs, St. Julien R.  

Chisholm, Hugh, editor  
Clarke, Erskine  

Clawson, Marion and Charles L. Stewart  

Clute, Robert  

Coclanis, Peter A.  

Cody, Cheryll Ann  


Cohen, Henning  
1953 *The South Carolina Gazette, 1732-1775* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).

Coldham, P. Wilson  

Colquhoun, Donald J.  
1969 *Geomorphology of the Lower Coastal Plain of South Carolina* (Columbia: South Carolina State Development Board, Division of Geology).

Colquhoun, Donald J., T.A. Bond, and D. Chappel  


Connor, Cynthia  
1989 “Sleep on and Take your Rest: Black Mortuary Behavior on the East Branch of the Cooper River, South Carolina,” Master’s Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Conrads, Paul A. and Pauley A. Smith  

Converse, Robert Shelton  
Cooke, C. Wythe

Cooper, Thomas, editor
1838 The Statutes at Large of South Carolina (Columbia).

Cooper, Jean L.

Cooper, William J. Jr. and Thomas E. Terrill

Corporation of Charleston
1822 An Account of the Late Intended Insurrection Among a Portion of the Blacks of the City of Charleston, South Carolina (Boston: Joseph W. Ingraham).

Cosgrove, Dennis
1984 Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape (Beckham, Kent: Croom Helm).


Crook, Ray


Cross, Joseph Russell

1985 Historic Ramblin’s through Berkeley (Berkeley County, SC: J.R. Cross).
Cross, Peter

Cross, Wilbur

Crum, Mason

Dalcho, Frederick
1820 *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South-Carolina, from the First Settlement of the Province, to The War of the Revolution; With Notices of the Present State of the church in Each Parish and Some Account of the Early Civil History of Carolina* (Charleston: E. Thaver).

Dahlman, Michael K. and Michael K. Dalman Jr.

Dalla Bona, Luke

Danese, Maria, Nicola Masini, Marilisa Biscione, Rose Lasaponara

Daniels, Stephen

Davis, Robert Scott
Deas, Anne Simons

Deetz, James


Delaware Department of Transportation

Delle, James A.


*Doar, William Richardson III*


*Dobson, David*


*Dolbilin, Nikolai P.*


*Domingo-Santos Juan, Rubén Fernández de Villarán, Igor Rapp-Arrarás, and Eva Corral-Pazos de Provens*


*Donnan, Elizabeth*


*Drago, Edmund L.*

Drayton, John
1802 *A View of South Carolina, as Respects Her Natural and Civil Concerns.*

Drucker, Lesley M. and Ronald W. Anthony

Duncan, J.

Duncan, James S. and Nancy G. Duncan

Dusinberre, William

Eastman, Margaret Middleton Rivers
2011 *Old Charleston Originals: From Celebrities to Scoundrels* (Charleston: History Press).

Ebert, James I.

Edelson, S. Max

Edgar, Walter

Edgar, Walter, editor
2006 *The South Carolina Encyclopedia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).
Edgar, Walter B. and N. Louise Bailey

Edwards, Lillie J.

Egerton, Douglas R.

Ellis, Clifton and Rebecca Ginsburg, editors

Eltis, David, Philip Morgan, and David Richardson

Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI)
2018  *ArcMap GIS for Desktop Software, version 10.5.1* (Redlands, CA).

Epperson, Terrence


Errante, James

Fausey, Norman R

Ferguson, Leland G.


Ferguson, Leland G. and David W. Babson
1986 “Survey of Plantation Sites along the East Branch of the Cooper River: A Model for Predicting Archaeological Site Location,” (Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina).
Fesler, Garrett


Fetters, Tom
2011 Email message to Nena Rice, April 12, 2011, in possession of author.

Finch, Aisha K.

Fischer, David Hackett

Fisher, Peter


Fisher, Peter, Chris Farrelly, Adrian Maddocks, and Clive Ruggles  

Flannery, Kent V. and Joyce Marcus, editors  

Forbes, Robert Pierce  

Ford, Lacy K.  

Foucault, Michel  

Fraser, Walter J. Jr.  
1989 *Charleston! Charleston!: The History of a Southern City* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).

1993 *Patriots, Pistols and Petticoats: “Poor Sinful Charles Town” during the American Revolution* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).


Gaffney, Vincent, K. Ostir, T. Podobniker, and Zoran Stančič  

Gaffney, Vincent and Zoran Stančič  
1996 *GIS Approaches to Regional Analysis* (Razprave Filosofske Fakultete).
Gaffney, Vincent, Zoran Stančič, and Helen Watson

Gaffney, Vincent and Pieter M. van Leusen

Gallay, Allan


Geggus, David P., editor

Genovese, Eugene D.

Gilchrist, Jane Foster

Gilikin, Margaret Wilson

Gill, S.J. and D. Howes

Ginsburg, Rebecca

Glassie, Henry
1975  Folk Housing in Middle Virginia: A Structural Analysis of Historic Artifacts (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press).

Glover, Lorri

Goodall, Jonathan L., David R. Maidment, and Jennifer Sorenson

Gomez, Michael A.

Gonzalez-Tennant, Edward
2016  “Recent Directions and Future Developments in Geographic Information Systems for Historical Archaeology,” Historical Archaeology 50(3):24-29.

Grassby, Richard

Greggus, David P., editor

Hadden, Sally E.
Hamer, Philip M., George Rogers, David R. Chesnutt, and C. James Taylor, editors

Hamer, Philip M., George Rogers, and David R. Chesnutt

Hamer, Philip M., George Rogers, and Peggy J. Wehage

Hamer, Philip M., George Rogers, and Peggy J. Clark

Hamilton, James Jr.

Hansson, Sven Ove

Harris, C. Leon, transcriber
1827 Pension Application of Evan Edwards, W10943, Catherine Edwards PA, transcribed and annotated in 1981. Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution Website

Hart, Emma

Hart, Linda
Hawley, Norman R.  


Heath, Barbara  

Heitzler, Michael J.  

2005 *Goose Creek, A Definitive History: Planters, Politicians, and Patriots* (Charleston: The History Press).

2012 *The Goose Creek Bridge: Gateway to Sacred Places* (AuthorHouse).

Helsley, Alexia Jones  

Hernandez, J. et al.  

Herzog, Irmela  
Heyward, Duncan Clinch
1983 *Seed from Madagascar* (Spartanburg: The Reprint Company).

Hicks, Theresa and Wesley White Taukhiray
1999 *Indian Connections and Other Ethnic Connections Beginning in 1670* (Spartanburg: Reprint Company).

Higuchi, Tadahiko

Hill, Max L. III

2003 “A Brief History of Middleburg Plantation East Branch of the Cooper River Parish of St. Thomas and St. Denis, Huger, South Carolina.” Copy in possession of author.

Hilliard, Samuel B.

Hines, Peter P.

Hirsch, Arthur H.
Hodder, Ian, editor

Hoelscher, Stephen

Holloway, Joseph E., editor

Hood, J. Edward

Howey, Meghan C.L.

Hudak, G. Joseph, Elizabeth Hobbs, Allyson Brooks, Carol Ann Sersland, and Crystal Phillips, editors
http://environment.transportation.org/documents/MN_Model/TOC.html

Hufman, Thomas

Ingold, Tim

Irving, John Beaufain.
Irving, L. Homfray
1918  *James Irving of Ironshore and his Descendants, 1713-1918* (Toronto: College Press Limited).

Isaac, Rhys

January, Alan F.

Janzen, D.E.

Jervey, Theodore D.

Johnson, Michael P.
2001  “Denmark Vesey and his Conspirators,” *William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*, 58(4).

Jones, Mark R.

Jones, Walter Burgwyn
1913  *John Burgwin, Carolinian; John Jones, Virginian: their Ancestors and Descendants* (Montgomery, AL: W.B. Jones).

Jordan, Winthrop D.

Joseph, J. Walter, III

Joseph, J.W. and Martha Zierden, editors
2002 Another’s Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies (The University of Alabama Press).

Joseph, Katherine A.

Joyner, Charles
1984 Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community (Champaign: University of Illinois Press).

Joyner, Stefanie L.
2003 Slave Housing Patterns within the Plantation Landscape of Coastal Georgia, Master’s thesis, University of Florida.

Judge, Chris
1994 “A Reconnaissance to Hagan Plantation” (38BK183), copy in possession of author.

Kamermans, Hans


Kantner, John  

Kantner, John and Ronald Hobgood  

Kay, Stephen and Timothy Sly  

Kaye, Anthony E.  

Kelley, Sean M.  
2016 *The Voyage of the Slave Ship ‘Hare’: A Journey into Captivity from Sierra Leone to South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).

Kihlstrom, John F.  

Killens, John  
1979 *The Trial Record of Denmark Vesey* (Boston: Beacon Press).

King, Adam  
2016 *Archaeology in South Carolina: Exploring the Hidden Heritage of the Palmetto State* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).

Kjerfve, Björn  
Koger, Larry  

Kohler, Timothy A. and Sandra C. Parker  

Kohn, David and Bess Glenn, editors  

Kovacik, Charles F.  

Kovacik, Charles F. and Winberry, John J.  

Kvamme, Kenneth L.  


Kvamme, Kenneth L., and M.A Jochim


Kvamme, Kenneth L., and Timothy A. Kohler


La Kose, Laura

Lake, Mark Winter

Lake, Mark Winter and Patricia G. Woodman

Lambert Frank

Latimer, W.J., F.Z. Hutton, Clarence Lounsbury, A.H. Meyer, and M. Earl Carr

Langley, Lynne
1996 “Brothers Decide to Protect Plantation from Development,” The Post and Courier, January 20, 1996, 17A.

Lees, William B.
1980 Old and in the Way: Archaeological Investigations at Limerick Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina, Anthropological Studies, Book 5 (Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina).

Lees, William B. and Kathryn M. Kimery-Lees

Leiding, Harriette Kershaw
1921 Historic Houses of South Carolina (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippencott, Co.).

Leland, Jack

Leone, Mark P.


Leone, Mark P., James M. Harmon, and Jessica L. Neuwirth

Leone, Mark P. and Silas D. Hurry

Leone, Mark P. and Parker B. Potter, Jr.
1984  *Archeological Annapolis: A Guide to Seeing and Understanding Three Centuries of Change* (Historic Annapolis, Inc. and the University of Maryland).

Leone, Mark P., Parker B. Potter, Jr. and Paul A. Shackel

Leusen, M. Pieter and Hans Kamermans
Lewis, Kenneth E.

Lewis, Pierce K.

Little, Thomas J.

Littlefield, Daniel C.
1981  *Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press).

Livingood, Patrick

Llobera, Marcos


Lock, Gordon and Trevor Harris  

Loftus, Geoffrey  

2005  “Witnesses’ eyes deceive them when distance is too great,” electronic document,  

London, Lawrence F.  
1991  “Maurice Moore,” *NCpedia*, online.

Long, Bobby M.  
1980  *Soil Survey of Berkeley County, South Carolina*, (USDA Soil Conservation Service, South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, and South Carolina Land Resources Conservation Commission).

Long, John H., editor  

Lowcountry Digital History Initiative  

Lowcountry Open Land Trust Website  
www.lowcountrylandtrust.org.

Lowther, Kevin G.  

Lucas, Jonathan III  
1822  *A General Order Citing Regulations for the Conduct of Troops during an Insurrection.*
Ludlum, David McWilliams

Lukács, Georg
1923 “Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat,” *History and Class Consciousness* (Merlin Press 1967; Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press).

Lukezic, Craig and Charles H. Fithian

Mack, Angela and Stephen Hoffius, editors

Manigault, Edward Lining and Horry Frost Prioleau

Mather, Ian Roderick and Gordon P. Watts, Jr.

Mathews, Maurice

Mayes, Douglas Owen
2006 “A Reanalysis of Five 19th Century South Carolina Major Hurricanes Using Local Data Sources,” Master’s Degree, Department of Geography, University of South Carolina.

McCartney, Martha W.
McCord, David J., editor

1840  *The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Containing the Acts Relating to Charleston, Courts, Slaves, and Rivers*, vol. 7 (Columbia: A.S. Johnston).

McCrary, Edward R.
1897  *The History of South Carolina under the Proprietary Government* (New York: Russell & Russell).

McDermott, John P.

McInnis, Maurie D.

McKittrick, Katherine

McKittrick, Katherine and Clyde Adrian Woods, editors
2007  *Black Geographies and the Politics of Place* (Ontario: Between the Lines Press).

Meinig, Donald William, editor

Menard, Russel R.

Mercantini, Jonathan
Middleton, Margaret Simons

Miles, Suzannah Smith


Miller, James David
2004 South by Southwest: Planter Emigration and Identity in the Slave South (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia).

Milling, Chapman
1940 Red Carolinians (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).

Mintz, Sidney and Richard Price

Mitchell, Arthur
2011 South Carolina Irish (Charleston: The History Press).

Mitchell, Don

Montello, D.R.

Mooney, James
1894 Siouan Tribes of the East (United States Bureau of American Ethnology).

Moore, W. Allan Jr.

Morgan, Philip D.


Morgan, Philip D. and George Terry

Morrison-Reed, Mark D.
2009 In Between: Memoir of an Integration Baby (Boston: Skinner House Books).

Mouser, Bruce L.


National Park Service
2005 Low Country Gullah Culture Special Resource Study and Final Environmental Impact Study, Southeast Regional Office, Atlanta, Georgia.

National Register of Historic Places
2002 Cooper River Historic District.

Neuendorf, Klaus K.E., James P. Mehl Jr., and Julia A. Jackson, editors

Neuffer, Claude, editor
1973 Names in South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina, Department of English).

Neuffer, Claude and Irene
1983 Correct Mispronunciations of Some South Carolina Names (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).

1954-81 Names in South Carolina, Volume 1-28 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).

New South Associates

Nichols, Mary
1988 “Is Anyone in the Market for a Memory?” The Berkeley Democrat, Wednesday, August 10, 1988, 1B.
Nolan, Kevin C. and Robert A. Cook

Norton, Kimberly Christine

O’Brien, Michael Joseph


O’Kane, James

Ogburn, Dennis

Olmsted, Frederick Law

Opala, Joseph A.


Orser, Charles E. Jr.


Orvin, Maxwell Clayton
1973 Historic Berkeley County, South Carolina, 1671-1900 (Charleston: Comprint).

Pandolf, K.B., B. Govoni, and R.F. Goldman

Peeters, J. Hans M.

Petersen, Bo

Pollitzer, William S.


Poplin, Eric C. and Charles F. Philips, Jr.
Porcher, Richard Dwight, Jr. and William Robert Judd

Poyas, Elizabeth Anne
1855  *The Olden Times in Carolina* (electronic edition)

1870  *Shadows of the Past, By the Ancient Lady* (Charleston, SC: William M. Mazyck).

Prioleau, Horry Frost and Edward Lining Manigault
2010  *Register of Carolina Huguenots and Partial Listing of 81 Refugee Families*, 4 volumes (lulu.com).

Project Priscilla
   Africanaheritage.com.

Prunty, Merle, Jr.

Pulsipher, Lydia

Quintana, Ryan A.

Randle, Lisa B.
2010  “‘Over’looking the African American Landscape along the East Branch of the Cooper River, Berkeley County, South Carolina, 1780-1820,”  Master’s Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Randle, Lisa B. and Jessica Ferrell
2010 “Was Denmark Vesey the Real Founder of The Citadel?” paper presented at Slavery and the University Conference, Emory University.

Raven, James

Redding, Mark SOPA

Renfrew, Colin and Penelope A. Mountjoy
1985 The Archaeology of Cult: The Sanctuary at Phylakopi (British School of Archaeology at Athens).

Renfrew, Colin and E. Zubrow, editors

Richards-Rissetto, Heather

Ridges, Malcolm

Rindge, Brenda B.
Rissetto, John D.

Roberts, Justin and Ian Beamish

Roberts, Leola

Robertson, David

Rodriguez, Julius P., editor


Rogers, George C., Jr.
1969 Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys (University of Oklahoma Press), Reprint 1980 (Columbia: University of South Carolina).

Rogers, George, David R. Chesnutt, and Walter Edgar

Rogers, George and David Chesnutt, editors
1974 The Papers of Henry Laurens (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).
Rogers, George, David R. Chesnutt, and Peggy J. Clark

1980  *The Papers of Henry Laurens, Volume 8: October 10, 1771-April 19, 1773* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).

Roper, L.H.

Rotman, Deborah L. and Michael S. Nassaney

Rowe, John H.

Rubillo, Tom

Rucker, Walter C.


Rudes, Blair
Ruggles, Clive L.N., David J. Medyckyj-Scott, and A. Gruffydd

Ruppel, Timothy, Jessica Neuwirth, Mark Leone, and Gladys-Marie Fry

Russell, Ann Ratliff

Salley, A.S. Jr., editor

Sanders, Joanne McRee, compiler and editor
2011 *Barbados Records, Wills and Administrations*, vol. 1, 2, and 3 (Clearfield County).

Sauer, Carl

Savage, Henry

Schantz, Mark S.

Schein, Richard H.
Schlesinger, Arthur Meier, editor

Schweninger, Loren


Schweninger, Loren, editor

Sebastian, Lynne and James W. Judge

Segal, E

Shanks, Michael and Christopher Tilley
Shlasko, Ellen


Simon, James, compiler

Singleton, Theresa A., editor

Singleton, Theresa A.,


Smith, Frederick H. and Hayden F. Bassett
Smith, Hayden R.

2010 Email to author, dated June 3, 2010.


Smith, Henry Augustus Middleton


1913 “Some Forgotten Towns in Lower South Carolina,” South Carolina Historical Magazine, 14:134-146.


1917b “The Orange Quarter and the First French Settlers in South Carolina,” The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine 18(3):101-123.

1931 The Baronies of South Carolina (Charleston: South Carolina Historical Society).


Smith, Mark, editor
2005 *Stono: Documenting and Interpreting a Southern Slave Revolt* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).

Smith, William Roy
1903 *South Carolina as a Royal Province, 1719-1776* (Macmillan Company).

Soil Systems, Inc.

South, Stanley

1978 “A Pilot Study for the Location of Certain Seventeenth Century Sites in Charleston and Berkeley Counties, South Carolina,” Manuscript on file at the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

South, Stanley and Michael Hartley

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control

South Carolina Historical Magazine
2011 South Carolina and Barbados Connections (Charleston: Home House Press).

South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine

South Carolina Historical Society
2011 South Carolina and Barbados Connections: Selections from the South Carolina Historical Magazine (Charleston, SC: Home House Press).

Souza, Marcos André Torres de and Marcos André Torres de Souza

Sparks, Randy J.


Spencer-Wood, Suzanne M.


Spencer-Wood, Suzanne M. and Sherene Baugher
Stančič, Zoran and Kenneth L. Kvamme  

Starobin, Robert S.  

Starobin, Robert S., editor  

Steen, Carl  

2011 Archeological Reconnaissance Survey of Selected Timber Tracts on Bonneau Ferry Wildlife Management Area, Berkeley County, South Carolina, Diachronic Research Foundation.

Steen, Carl and Jodie A. Barnes  

Stine, Linda F.  
1991 *Revealing Landscapes in South Carolina: Historical Archaeological Perspectives of the Land and Its People*. Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists and the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Stine, Linda F. and Natalie P. Adams  
Stine, Linda F., Lesley M. Drucker, Martha Zierden, and Christopher Judge, editors
1993  *Historic Landscapes in South Carolina: Historical Archaeological Perspectives of the Land and its People* (Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists and the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology).

Stoney, Louisa Cheves, editor

Stoney, Samuel Gaillard

1964  *Plantations of the Carolina Lowcountry* (Charleston: Carolina Art Association).

Sullivan, Buddy
2014  “Lachlan McIntosh (1727-1806),” *New Georgia Encyclopedia*, online.

Surface-Evans, Sarah L.

Surface-Evans, Sarah L. and Devin A. White

Swanton, John R.

Taylor, Peter James and Ron John Johnston

Tepper, Michael, editor

Terry, George

Thomas, Brian


Thomas, Jonathan P. Jr.
1930 “The Barbadians in Early South Carolina,” South Carolina Historical Magazine.

Thomas, Julian

Thompson, Michael D.

Thorpe, Francis Newton, editor

Tidewater Atlantic Research, Inc.

Tilley, Christopher


Tilley, Christopher, editor

Timmons, Ray
n.d. “A Brief History of Middleburg Plantation, East Branch of the Cooper River, Parish of St. Thomas and St. Denis, Huger, South Carolina."

Tobler, Waldo
1993 “Three Presentations on Geographical Analysis and Modeling: Non-Isotropic Geographic Modeling; Speculation on the Geometry of Geography; and Global Spatial Analysis,” National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis Technical Reports 93-1, UCSB.
Trigger, Bruce G.

Turnage, G.W. and J.L. Smith

Turner, Frederick Jackson

Turner, Lorenzo Dow

Twinning, Mary A. and Keith E. Baird, editors

United States Army Corps of Engineers

United States Department of Agriculture

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service
1963-1990 Soil Surveys for Selected Counties of South Carolina (Columbia).

1982 South Carolina Resources Inventory: A Summary Report from the 1982 National Resources Inventory (Columbia).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey Staff
United States Department of Interior, National Park Service

United States Geographic Service
Map Scales Fact Sheet online.

Upton, Dell


Van Hove, Doortje


Van Leusen, Pieter Martijn


Van Leusen, Pieter Martijn and Hans Kamermans, editors

Verhagen, Philip and Whitley, Thomas G.

Vlach, John Michael


Voss, Barbara L.

Waddell, Eugene
1980 Indians of the South Carolina Lowcountry, 1562-1751 (Columbia: University of South Carolina, Southern Studies).

Wade, Richard C.
1964 “The Vesey Plot,” *Journal of Southern History* 30(2).

Wade, Tasha and Shelly Sommer, editors

Wansleeben, M. and L.B.M. Verhart

Wassamasaw Tribe of Varnertown Indians Website.

Waterhouse, Richard

Wayne, Lucy B.

Weir, Robert M.

Wescott, Konnie L. and R. Joe Brandon, editors

Wheatley, David


Wheatley, David and Mark Gillings

White, Laura Porcher

White, Devin A. and Sarah L. Surface-Evans
2012 Least Cost Analysis of Social Landscapes (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press).

Whiteaker, Tim
2004 Center for Research in Water Resources, University of Texas, Austin. www.crwr.utexas.edu/gis/gishydro05/Time/RespresentingSpaceAndTime.htm

Whitley, Thomas G.


Whitley, Thomas G. and Lacy M. Hicks  

Whitley, Thomas G., Connie Huddleston, Jennifer Webber, and Dea Mozingo  


Widmer, Randolph J.  

Wiles, Oliver R.  

Wiley, Gordan  

Wood, Betty  

Wood, Brian M. and Zoë J. Wood

Wood, Peter H.

Wright, Donald R.
2000  African Americans in the Colonial Era: From African Origins through the American Revolution (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc.).

Wright, Patricia Noela
2016  “Predicting the Presence of Historic and Prehistoric Campsites in Virginia’s Chesapeake Bay Counties,” Master’s Thesis, University of Southern California.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram

Yentsch, Amy E.

Young, Jeffrey Robert

Zierden, Martha A., Lesley A. Drucker, and Jeanne Calhoun
2010  “Landscape and Social Relations at Charleston Townhouse Sites (1770-1850),” *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*.

Zook, George F.