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ARCHEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS AT
REDCLIFFE PLANTATION,
AIKEN COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

by

James D. Scurry
INTRODUCTION

During May and June 1981 archeological investigations were conducted at Redcliffe Plantation State Park in Aiken County, South Carolina. The project was carried out by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, under the direction of James D. Scurry, and was sponsored by a grant from the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism who own and manage the property. The focus of this study was the site of a burned structure traditionally known as Old Yard or Old Redcliffe which reportedly predated the Redcliffe Plantation house (Billings n.d.: 8-9).

The history surrounding the Old Yard site is sketchy. It has been suggested that this house was built in the 1770s by then-owner and wealthy Indian trader George Galphin, who maintained a permanent residence at nearby Silver Bluff. At present, however, no documents have been located to support this contention.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to define the temporal and spatial nature of the Old Yard site. Temporal placement of the Old Yard structure was determined through examination of various datable architectural artifacts. These artifacts indicate a temporal range between which the house was built. The spatial orientation of the site was determined by examination of the distribution of various relevant categories and by plotting the extent of any potential architectural features.

A more problem-oriented purpose of this study was to determine which of several methods was better suited for delineation of the house boundaries. This problem was especially critical since excavations at other plantation sites in South Carolina involve houses with cellars, while the structure at Redcliffe was on pillars. Solutions to this problem were attempted by distribution comparison of various artifact categories from the site. These distributions were correlated with the occurrence of various architectural features. The results indicate that some artifacts are better indications of site size. However, absolute definition necessitates correlation of several factors.

The following report represents the results of the archeological investigations at Redcliffe Plantation. It is intended to provide basic temporal, spatial, and interpretive analyses that will help to determine the nature and extent of past human occupation in the Redcliffe area.
PHYSIOGRAPHIC SETTING

Redcliffe Plantation consists of a 370-acre tract of land located off U.S. 278 approximately 3 miles south of Beach Island, South Carolina (Fig. 1.). The plantation was granted to the people of South Carolina by the late John S. Billings and has been incorporated into the state park system. Geologically, the site lies in the Atlantic Upper Coastal Plain and is underlaid by sediments ranging in age from the Cretaceous to Early to Median Miocene periods (Colquhoun 1969: 3).

![Map showing the location of Redcliffe Plantation.](image)

Although the exact soil data from Aiken County are not available, the primary soil in the Redcliffe area is from the Marlboro-Faceville-Magnolia association. These soils are located on broad, nearly level to gently sloping ridges. Soils from this association are well-drained and easily susceptible to wind and water erosion on sloping surfaces (Craddock and Ellerbe 1965).

The Upper Coastal Plain of South Carolina is included in the ecotonal area between the oak-hickory and magnolia forest of the Southern Temperate Deciduous Forest Biome (Shelford 1963: 19, 56). Vegetation characteristic of the zone is primarily pine, including loblolly, longleaf, and shortleaf species. The variety of understory vegetation found in the area includes scrub holly, various shrub oaks, saw palmetto, and staggerbush (Shelford 1963: 78). These forests generally support sparse populations of small game; however, some deer herds are supported in the pine scrubs. Among other species associated with the ecotonal zone are rabbits, ground doves, mourning doves, scrub jays, and blue-gray gnat-catchers (Shelford 1963: 78).
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE OLD YARD
SETTLEMENT AT REDCLIFFE PLANTATION

Galphin Ownership of Redcliffe

Little is known of the occupation at Redcliffe Plantation until its purchase by James D. Hammond in 1855. This tract was probably part of the property willed to the children of George Galphin in 1782, but the exact circumstances surrounding its acquisition by George Galphin was uncertain (Billings n.d. b). After his father's death, Thomas Galphin managed the enormous estate from his residence at Silver Bluff. Thomas, however, proved to be a careless businessman and by the mid-1790s a series of lawsuits had seriously depleted the Galphin fortunes. In 1796, Thomas Galphin, acting on the behalf of the Galphin heirs, sold all of the Galphin holdings near Silver Bluff except for the property in Beech Island (Hamer n.d.).

From Thomas Galphin the Redcliffe property eventually passed to Dr. Milledge Galphin. Little is known about the occupation or economic development of the property under Milledge Galphin's ownership, since no listing of his name can be found in the agriculture census data for the Edgefield district (MCASC/ED/1850). The population census of 1850, however, lists a Dr. Milledge Galphin, a wife, Ann, and seven children ranging in age from two to twenty-eight years. While no records of agricultural production exist, the population census lists the occupation of two of the Galphin sons as farmers (MCPSC/ED/1850: 126). It seems likely, therefore, that some small scale agriculture was a part of the occupation of Redcliffe at this time.

James H. Hammond and Redcliffe Plantation

In 1855, Dr. Milledge Galphin sold the Redcliffe property to a wealthy planter, James H. Hammond, who had purchased the Silver Bluff estate some 24 years earlier (Scurry et al. 1980: 27; Edmonds n.d.: 1). Hammond had well established himself in the social and political arena by the time he purchased the Redcliffe property. He was deeply involved in the nullification controversy, and by 1840, he was strongly urging the Southern states to secede from the Union. Hammond felt that it would take a minimum of five states to make the movement effective (Edmonds n.d.: 6-7). In 1842, Hammond was elected to the office of Governor of South Carolina. During his tenure, he transformed the Citadel in Charleston and the arsenal in Columbia into military academies and directed an attack on the Bank of South Carolina. By 1850, however, Hammond had left office in the midst of two personal scandals (Edmonds n.d.: 7). He was later elected to the U.S. Senate but poor health and the election of Lincoln hastened his resignation in 1860 (Edmonds n.d.: 9).
Hammond's greatest achievement was in the area of agricultural development. In 1831, he had acquired the former Galphin lands at Silver Bluff. Although once productive, years of mismanagement had virtually destroyed the economic viability of the plantation. However, after nine years under his direction, the property at Silver Bluff was valued at almost $60,000 (Scurry et al. 1980: 28). James Hammond was also an agricultural innovator, experimenting widely with a variety of crops, especially fruit trees and vineyards. He also began an agricultural society among the planters in Beech Island and, as Governor, established a state agricultural survey (Edmonds n.d.).

In 1855, Hammond and his family moved to Redcliffe and, in 1857, he began construction of the present-day Redcliffe house. While there is no mention of the dwelling at Redcliffe prior to the 1857 house built by Hammond, his residency must have been at the Old Yard house. Although Hammond was a successful planter and experimenter, the property at Redcliffe was not intensively farmed. It was intended as a country retreat, an escape from the pressures of managing the estate. As a result, the extensive settlement and activity areas usually associated with plantations are absent from Redcliffe.

After the death of James Hammond in 1864, the Redcliffe property was passed to his son Harry, who continued to manage the estate. The younger Hammond continued the agricultural endeavors established by his father, but after the Civil War, the Hammond enterprises never regained their previous status (Scurry et al. 1980). The Redcliffe property remained in the hands of the Hammonds and their descendants until its transfer to the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism in 1973.

The Old Yard Structure at Redcliffe

The only known reference to the structure at the Old Yard site is two 1911 photographs with some scribbled captions in the photograph album of John S. Billings (Billings n.d. a). These photographs (see Figs. 2 and 3) show an L-shaped structure constructed on pillars. The L-wing, which is labelled as the kitchen, is located on the left side of the house, with a chimney attached at the back. The main body of the house has two additional internal chimneys situated at either end. No additional outbuildings or settlement areas are mentioned in association with the Old Yard structure.

No documents have been located which pinpoint the date of construction or the extent the house was used. Since Hammond moved there in 1855, and the Redcliffe mansion was not completed until 1858, it can be assumed that occupation of the house did not end with the conveyance of the property in 1855. Notes of John Billings refer to the recollection of sporadic occupations of the house during the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Billings n.d. a). The exact nature of these occupations is unclear, however.
Figure 2. The Old Yard house at Redcliffe Plantation in 1911. (Courtesy of the South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina).

Figure 3. The kitchen wing of the Old Yard house at Redcliffe Plantation in 1911. (Courtesy of South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina).
The archeological investigations of the Old Yard site at Redcliffe plantation were designed to provide basic descriptive information regarding the structure which stood there prior to 1916. Since the available historical documentation provided only limited data concerning the structure, basic temporal and spatial placement of the site had to be ascertained through examination of the archeological record. Of primary importance to this study was the recovery of data regarding the date of construction and length of occupation, the spatial extent, and the geographic orientation of the structure. In addition, the archeological investigations at Redcliffe were designed to examine the artifact patterning within and around the house and to better understand refuse disposal behavior at the site. The refuse disposal patterns could potentially be used to isolate various activity areas in the immediate vicinity of, or related to, the occupancy of the house. In addition, comparison of artifact patterning inside and outside the structure could help define the extent of the house in areas where architectural and feature data are lacking.

Research Methodology

Because there was the possibility of obtaining diverse information from the examinations, a series of different strategies was incorporated into the research design. In order to define the spatial limits and geographic orientation of the structure, two perpendicular trenches were initiated across the site. These trenches consisted primarily of a series of 11 interconnected 5 x 5 excavation units (Fig. 4). Careful attention to the profiles of these trenches allowed for an accurate definition of the limits of a thin charcoal layer which was interpreted as a reasonable structural boundary marker. Although interconnected, each of the 5 x 5 foot squares was excavated separately in order to maintain horizontal control and allow for comparison of the artifact patterning between different areas of the site.

As the excavation progressed, it became apparent that the extremely high density of brick rubble and the compact ground would not allow for completion of the 5 x 5 foot excavation unit trenches in the time allotted for the project. Therefore, a series of 11 1.5-foot slot trenches were excavated through areas of the site where the 5 x 5 units had not been completed.

A third series of nine additional 5 x 5 foot squares was excavated outside of the defined limits of the structure to compare the internal and external artifact patterning at the site. Comparison of artifacts from both internal and external excavation units could help define the spatial extent of the site in areas where stratigraphic and/or feature data are
Figure 4. The excavation units and slot trenches at Redcliffe Plantation.
absent. In addition, analysis of the external artifact patterning could allow for the definition of certain activity areas associated with occupancy of the house. Two additional 5 x 5 foot units were excavated in areas where it was thought features might be located.

Both the 21 5 x 5 foot excavation units and the 11 slot trenches were tied into a grid system which began at S980 W980. These arbitrary designations were selected in order to allow for future archeological investigations around the main house settlement to be tied into the existing grid system. A permanent datum was established at point S1010 W1000. Excavated units were designated by the coordinates of their southwest point, and all elevations and measurements were taken in relation to this point.

All material from the excavated 5 x 5 foot units was screened through 1/4 inch hardware cloth mesh, according to the natural stratigraphy of the site. Any features encountered during the project were mapped, measured and photographed. The degree of excavation of these features, however, was dependent on the available time and any unexcavated features were carefully preserved for future archeological examination.

The cultural material recovered during this excavation was processed by the laboratory staff at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina and is currently in curation at the same facility. Most material was saved, except for the huge quantities of brick, which were weighed and discarded. All artifacts, field notes, drawings, and photographs from the excavation at Redcliffe Plantation are being curated at the Institute and are available for scientific study.

Physical Structure of the Old Yard Site

Since much of the archeological interpretation of the Old Yard site is dependent on an accurate definition of contrasting soil patterns, a brief description of the physical structure of the site is appropriate. Unlike the majority of Redcliffe Plantation, the area surrounding the Old Yard site has been little affected by plowing and/or erosion.

The site is located approximately 250 yards west of the main Redcliffe settlement and is situated on a small ridge knoll overlooking a tributary of the Savannah River. It is nestled between eight large trees which have probably served to protect the site from encroaching plowed activities. Recently, the park superintendent has built a house immediately adjacent to the east and a chain-link fence dog pen has been constructed on the extreme western part of the site (Fig. 5).

Generally, two stratigraphic sequences characterize this site. The first is the natural stratigraphy found in areas outside the house structure. The soil profile from the eastern wall of Trench A at square S990 W1050 is indicative of this stratigraphy (Fig. 6):
0-.5 feet: light gray sandy clay with heavy root zone near top.

.5-.8+ feet: bright orange sandy clay.

Figure 5. The general setting of the Old Yard site.

The stratigraphy within the area of the structure was much more marked and was generally considered reliable as a structure boundary indicator. This sequence is well illustrated by the eastern wall of the Main Trench at square S1020 W1050 (Fig. 7) which was composed of:

0-.4 feet: medium to dark gray sandy clay with some charcoal and pockets of brick rubble

.4-.7 feet: lens of brick and mortar rubble

.7-.8 feet: small lens of charcoal

.8-1.1 feet: brown orange sandy clay with some charcoal and mottling

1.1-1.3+ feet: bright orange sandy clay
Figure 6. Sections of Trench A at S990 W1050 illustrating undisturbed natural stratigraphy outside of the structure at the Old Yard site.

Figure 7. Drawing of sections of the Main Trench at S1020 W1035 illustrating the stratigraphy inside the structure at the Old Yard Site.
The soils of both stratigraphic sequences were extremely compact as the Redcliffe area was unseasonably dry. Several afternoon showers loosened the soil and made screening much easier.

Temporal Definition of the Old Yard Site

Little is known of the construction date of the structure at the Old Yard site. Traditional interpretations suggest that the house was constructed by George Galphin during the mid-eighteenth century; however, no historical documentation has been located to support this date. Tradition also suggests that the house was occupied until it burned in 1916. The purpose of this section is to determine the construction date of the house and the length of occupation at the site.

To determine the construction date of the house, various temporally diagnostic architectural artifacts were examined. Documented changes in the technology associated with the manufacture of nails and wood screws allow for the relative dating of these artifacts at the site. Prior to 1790 all nails were hand manufactured. These hand-wrought nails are characteristically square- to rectangular-bodied with a pointed tip and a hand-formed head (Mercer 1923: 3-4; Nelson 1968). These nails, in profile, always taper toward the tip on all sides.

Between 1790 and 1800, technology was developed that allowed mass shearing of nails from a metal bar. These cut nails are always rectangular and have a flat tip. In addition, the sides which were sheared have a constant thickness profile, while the two outside edges are tapered toward the tip. Before 1825, the heads of the cut nails had to be handwrought, because the technology had not been developed that allowed the heads to be stamped. In 1825, a machine was patented that would cut the nail and stamp the heads in the same process (Mercer 1923: 10). Cut nails with stamped heads were used universally until 1890, when they were replaced by cheaply made wire nails.

Wood screws are also temporal markers in the construction of a building. Before 1846, all wood screws were blunt unless they had been hand filed. After 1846, the pointed wood screw totally replaced the earlier version because it could easily start without punching a starting hole (Mercer 1923: 24-25).

Of the total nails recovered during the excavations, 6104 (93.0%) were cut nails with stamped heads, 444 (6.8%) were wire nails, 11 (.10%) were wrought and 6 (.1%) were cut nails with wrought heads (Fig. 8). These percentages indicate that the house was built after 1825.

A breakdown of the percentages of non-pointed and pointed wood screws indicates that 54.0% of the wood screws recovered from the excavation were non-pointed while the remaining 46.0% were pointed. In addition, 13 of the non-pointed wood screws were associated with hinge and door lock parts (Fig. 8). The association of the non-pointed wood screws with architectural hardware indicates the latest construction date of 1846. The combi-
Figure 8. Various architectural hardware from the Old Yard site. A-D: cut nails, E-G: non-pointed wood screws, and H-I: hinges with non-pointed wood screws.
nation of the nail and wood screw architectural data suggests that the structure at the Old Yard site was built between 1825 and 1846.

Length of Occupation of the Site

Traditional accounts suggest that the structure at the Old Yard site was occupied continuously from its construction until it burned in 1916. With the establishment of a construction date range of post 1825 to pre-1846, the occupation span of the site was maximally defined as the 91-year interval between 1825 and 1916. The artifact assemblage from the Old Yard excavations generally support this occupation range. Of the total 87 temporally diagnostic ceramics, 84 (96.4%) can be dated to the 19th and early 20th centuries. The remaining 3.6% consist of various pearlware types which date from the late 18th to the first-quarter of the 19th centuries (Noel Hume 1970: 130).

The greatest number of the datable ceramics from the site consist of undecorated ironstone-whitewares (see Table 1). These ceramics were manufactured from 1820 until sometime after 1920 (South 1974: 334-335). Their predominance at the Old Yard site indicates an occupation year consistent with the range suggested by the architectural and historical data. This range is further supported by the more temporally diagnostic ceramic data which indicate that transfer-printed whiteware (1820-1850+) and molded ironstone (1850-1900) are the second and third most common types representing 21.8 and 10.3% respectively of the total datable ceramics (see Table 1). The cumulative date range of these ceramics (1820-1900) is consistent with the range of the more general undecorated ironstone-whiteware category.

Analysis of the glass artifacts excavated from the site generally supports the occupation range of the 19th to early 20th century indicated by the ceramic assemblage. The most common glass types are dark green (47.0%), that was produced from the 17th century until 1880, and clear glass (43.0%), that has been manufactured continuously from 1860 until the present (Kendrick 1968: 32; Jones 1971: 11).

Of particular interest is the presence of several monogrammed S. C. Dispensary bottle fragments. These bottles were manufactured specifically for the dispensary between 1899 and 1907 (Huggins 1971: 10) and although this representation is minimal, the occurrence of these fragments clearly indicates some type of activity at the site during the early 20th century. The nature and extent of this late occupation, however, is unknown at the present time.

The artifact data from the Old Yard excavations suggest an occupation year consistent with the architectural and historical data of a maximum 91 years occurring between 1825 and 1916. Although the exact length and intensity of the occupation is unknown, the data indicate that the primary occupation began between 1825 and 1850, and continued until at least the turn of the century. Mrs. Galphin Murray, a long-time resident of the area, remembered attending piano classes in the house during the early 1900s and indicated that the house was probably permanently occupied until
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Category</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>% of Artifact Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted polychrome pearlware</td>
<td>1795-1815</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underglazed blue pearlware</td>
<td>1780-1820</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated pearlware</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed whiteware</td>
<td>1820-1850+</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular ware</td>
<td>1795-1890</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green shell edged whiteware</td>
<td>1820-1920+</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue hand painted whiteware</td>
<td>1820-1920+</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome whiteware</td>
<td>1820-1920+</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated ironstone-whiteware</td>
<td>1820-1920+</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded ironstone</td>
<td>1850-1900</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline glazed stoneware</td>
<td>1800-1900+</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldspathic glazed stoneware</td>
<td>1800-1900+</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany slipware</td>
<td>1800-1900+</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CERAMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear bottle glass</td>
<td>1864-present</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green glass</td>
<td>? - 1880</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkglass jar liner</td>
<td>1800-present</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese glass</td>
<td>pre-1800-1917</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. Dispensary (Manganese)</td>
<td>1899-1907</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dates are from Noel Hume 1970; South 1974; Lewis and Haskell 1981; Green 1970; Kendrick 1968; Belknap 1949; and Jones 1971.
around 1910 (Mrs. Galphin Murray, personal communication). It is unknown to what extent the house was occupied in 1915-1916; however, since the house burned as the result of the spontaneous combustion of wet hay stored beneath it, it seems most likely that permanent habitation of the house had ended prior to 1916.

Spatial Definition and Geographic Orientation of the Old Yard Site

Introduction

Before attempting to define the spatial limits of the Old Yard site, a distinction should be made between the Old Yard site as a structure and the Old Yard site as an area of activity. In the former, Old yard site refers to the physical limits of the actual structure known to have existed there, whereas, in the latter, the term refers to the area of activity presumed to have been associated with the structure. The spatial extent of these site aspects will be defined.

Spatial Definition of the Old Yard Structure

During the excavation of unit S1055 W1040, a rectangular brick column was uncovered which presumably marked the southern edge of the house site. Located to the north or interior of this feature was a distinct layer of brick rubble overlaying a lens of charcoal, while the southern half of the square was lacking this stratification (Fig. 9). Further excavation of the site interior showed a stratigraphy similar to the northern half of unit S1055 W1040 (Fig. 10), but with varying amounts of brick. It was inferred from these test units, therefore, that the presence of this distinctive layer of charcoal was indicative of location within the structure. As the allotted field time elapsed, the sampling strategy was changed to incorporate a series of 1.5 foot slot trenches in an attempt to define the boundaries of the charcoal layer and the house boundary. Figure 11 illustrates the spatial limits of the structure as defined by the occurrence of charcoal. The outline presented in the figure indicates that the structure was L-shaped, similar to the house represented in the 1911 photograph with the L-wing located on the left side of the house (see Figs. 2 and 3).

Upon completion of the slot trenches, four brick features were uncovered outside the defined charcoal area. Three of these features were located in a line approximately 10.5 to 11 feet east of the eastern boundary, while the fourth feature was located approximately 3.5 to 4 feet west of the western charcoal boundary. The consistency of distance of the features from the edge of the charcoal stain suggests that these features represent the front and back porches of the house and that less intense burning in these areas produced no detectable charcoal layer.

The dimensions of the main body of the house as indicated by the charcoal are approximately 50 feet in width and 34 feet from front to back
Figure 9. North profile of square S1055 W1050 showing feature 3 and charcoal lens in the northern section of the square.

Figure 10. Eastern profile of the Main Trench area showing brick rubble and charcoal stratigraphy.
Figure 11. CALFORM map showing the inferred spatial extent of the Old Yard structure from the distribution of charcoal.
with an additional 16 feet in length through the L wing. The inclusion of the porch dimensions indicates a width of 50 feet and a length of 48.0 to 49 feet and a length of 61 feet through the L wing.

Spatial Definition of the Old Yard Site

In order to define the site's spatial extent as a unit of activity associated with the Old Yard structure, the distribution of non-structural artifacts from each excavation unit was plotted with the Synagraphic Computer Mapper Program (SYMAP). This program was designed to interpolate artifact densities between sample points through nearest-neighbor and basic statistical methods (Dougenik and Sheahan 1975). The resulting printout outlines potential areas of high artifact densities that are inferred to represent highly utilized activity/occupation areas.

Because the sampling design was primarily oriented toward the recovery of data associated directly with the Old Yard house, inclusion of architectural artifacts in the determination of the site extent would bias the data toward the structure and would tend to degrade the significance of any artifact clustering outside the house boundaries. Therefore, structural or architectural artifacts were excluded from this analysis. The distribution of non-structural artifacts indicates three areas of concentration which roughly correspond with the inferred shape of the Old Yard structure (see Fig. 12). Inclusion of these concentrations extends the dimensions of the Old Yard site to encompass a minimum area of 80 feet north to south by 55 feet northwest to northeast and 90 feet southwest to southeast through the kitchen area. In order to determine the full site extent, more sampling should be initiated, especially along the northern and southern borders of the present sample area.

Geographic Orientation of the Old Yard House

Traditional oral interpretations suggest that the structure at the Old Yard site was oriented toward the east, facing the present day Redcliffe settlement (John Shaw Billings to Gene Cobb, personal communication). More recent recollections indicate that the house faced the "red cliffs" to the west toward Augusta, Georgia (Mrs. Galphin Murray, personal communication). In an attempt to determine the geographic orientation of the structure, available information regarding the physical nature of the house was correlated with the archeological evidence recovered during the excavations.

The available documentation pertaining to the Old Yard house consists almost entirely of the 1911 photographs included with this report (see Figs. 2 and 3). These photographs indicate that the structure was L-shaped with a kitchen wing located on the left side of the building (Billings n.d.: 7-9). In addition, the main body of the house appears to have contained two internal chimneys while a third chimney was located on the back wall of the L or kitchen wing.

The reconstruction of the house outline as defined by the spatial extent of the charcoal layer confirms the L shape of the Old Yard structure (see Fig. 11). For this L wing to be located on the back left side of the
Figure 12. SYMAP showing the distribution of non-structural artifacts at the Old Yard site.
building, as indicated by the photographs, the house would have to have been oriented west toward Augusta. This geographic orientation, although in conflict with the recollections of former owner John Shaw Billings, is further supported by a map of the distribution of brick weights at the site. There are two major concentrations of brick that occur at opposite sides of the sampling frame (see Fig. 13). These brick concentrations probably represent the remains of the three chimneys shown in the 1911 photographs. Since two chimneys are associated with the left side of the house, the greater spatial extent of the brick concentration around squares S1055 W1050 and S1060 W1020 probably represent the remains of these two chimneys. This location supports a western orientation of the house (toward Augusta) and is consistent with other archeological data.

Artifact Patterning and Refuse Disposal
Behavior at the Old Yard Site

Introduction

The science of archeology attempts to reconstruct and explain the behavior of past cultural systems through the examination of material remains left behind. Essential to this understanding is the assumption that culture is the expression of learned patterns of behavior and that these patterns will be reflected consistently in the archeological record. As a result, the spatial patterning of artifacts across a site should be reflective of the spatial patterning of the activities associated with their use (Binford 1964: 425).

Although this assumption remains one of the cornerstones of basic archeological interpretation, recent studies relating to the processes of site information have found that the transformation of an object from an active past of a cultural system to a part of the archeological record is complex and often, is not a unilinear process (Schiffer 1972, 1976; South 1977: 296-297). The transformation of an object into the archeological record may result from both material and cultural processes. The cultural processes have been defined as loss, abandonment and discard, with each occurring as the result of a different behavioral process. Generally, loss refers to the unintentional deposition of an artifact at the termination of site occupation (Schiffer 1976: 32-36). The abandonment of the site may be intentional, in which case, a certain selectivity for usable items may occur, or it may be sudden and unintentional (such as abandonment because of fire), in which case, generally well-curated items may become part of the archeological record.

The process of discard may be defined as the intentional deposition or redeposition of waste materials at a site. Two primary types of discard have been identified: primary refuse in which the material is deposited at the location of its use, and secondary refuse in which the location of deposition is different from the location of its use (Schiffer 1972: 161). Because of the intensive and permanent nature of most historic occupations, refuse disposal at historic sites tend to be secondary depositions (Lewis and Haskell 1981).
**Figure 17:** SYMAP showing the distribution of brick at the Old Yard site.

### 38AK47 Redcliffe Plantation
Excavations at the Old Yard
Brick Weights (in grams)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Value Range Applying to Each Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3113.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123311.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>00000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale: 10 feet
South (1977: 47-48, 179) has further defined two types of secondary refuse: adjacent and peripheral. Adjacent secondary refuse consists of material which has been deposited directly adjacent to occupied structures and typically exhibits a low bone-to-total artifact ratio, while peripheral secondary refuse has been deposited away from the occupied structures and exhibits a high bone-to-total artifact ratio. The selectivity associated with this differential deposition is that unusually large and/or offensively odorous refuse will be discarded away from the main occupation areas.

Refuse Disposal at the Old Yard Site

The excavation at the Old Yard site identified three distinct concentrations of refuse disposal material (see Fig. 12). The heaviest deposit, A, was located to the south of the structure adjacent to the kitchen of the house with two smaller deposits, B and C, at the front and along the northern side of the house. The location of these deposits, is consistent with the locational patterning of refuse areas from other sites in the southeast (South 1977: 47). So consistent is this patterning on 18th century British-American sites that the location of doorways could be discerned through examination of refuse disposal patterns in the absence of architectural data. Examination of the proportion of bone-to-total artifacts recovered from the excavation units in these areas indicates that the three deposits represent adjacent secondary refuse disposal (see Table 2). Only one of the areas, A, contained bone material, and the proportions were extremely small.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Bone Fragments</th>
<th>Total Artifact Less Bone</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3712</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further examination of the artifact assemblages from each of these deposits indicates that the majority of non-structural artifacts are ceramics, storage jars and bottles, and other domestic related materials (see Table 3). The predominance of these materials and the relative absence of
TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE OF ARTIFACT CLASSES FROM THE
DISPOSAL AREAS AT THE OLD YARD SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Category</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>B (%)</th>
<th>C (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>424 (9.5%)</td>
<td>22 (11.5%)</td>
<td>65 (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>3953 (88.8%)</td>
<td>165 (86.4%)</td>
<td>3628 (97.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>16 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2 (1.05%)</td>
<td>1 (0.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>4 (0.08%)</td>
<td>4 (0.11%)</td>
<td>1 (0.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>7 (0.2%)</td>
<td>3 (0.08%)</td>
<td>1 (0.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>1 (0.02%)</td>
<td>2 (1.05%)</td>
<td>12 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>45 (1.02%)</td>
<td>2 (1.05%)</td>
<td>12 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>(0.001%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

other specialized artifacts indicate that the occupation of the Old Yard site was domestically oriented and that no specialized activities were located in this area.

SUMMARY

The archeological investigations of the Old Yard site at Redcliffe Plantation were designed to provide basic temporal and spatial data regarding a portion of the plantation of which little documentation was available. In addition, these examinations provided a unique opportunity to examine the refuse disposal occurring at a 19th century domestic site.

Traditional historical data suggested that the structure at the Old Yard site was built during the 1770s by then-owner George Galphin and that the geographic orientation of the house was to the east toward the present day Redcliffe settlement. Architectural data recovered during the excavation, however, indicate that the house was built sometime between 1825 and 1846, and that it was occupied relatively continuously until at least the first decade of the 20th century. Furthermore, the stratigraphic and architectural data indicate that the house faced to the west toward Augusta.

A map of the distribution of non-structural artifacts identified three areas of refuse disposal in the immediate vicinity of the house. The
spatial arrangement of these disposal areas indicated that the refuse was discarded near existing doorway and porch areas. In addition, the low bone-to-artifact ratio of the excavation units located within these concentrations indicated that the refuse was associated with adjacent secondary refuse behavior and that additional peripheral secondary refuse middens were probably located away from the house outside the sampling areas. The spatial arrangement of the refuse areas and their low bone-to-artifact ratio are consistent with the refuse disposal patterns that have been found at other domestic sites in the southeast.
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