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Preface

The Diocese of South Carolina is rightfully proud of the St. James Church and its illustrious heritage. This grand old church, located near Goose Creek in Berkeley County, is recognized as the oldest standing church in South Carolina and one of the finest examples of an early American, rural, Anglican church to be found anywhere in the country.

Today the church stands as the sole survivor from a bygone time when a complex of church-related buildings stood nearby. These buildings did not exist at the same time. Various ones were constructed at different times and for different purposes. All ultimately fell into ruin, except for the church.

Other than the present church, related structures known to have existed on the property were a wooden church that predated the present brick structure, a vestry building, sexton's house, and one or possibly two parsonages. The earliest parsonage was probably constructed of wood and is thought to be associated with the earliest wooden church.

An 18th century school, built and run by the church, was not within the boundaries of the present day church property, therefore its status is not addressed in this report.

Goose Creek is currently experiencing tremendous growth. Lands adjacent to those of the church are commanding premium prices. This rapid change in an area that has been rural until recent years places the Vestry and Church Wardens of the Episcopal Church of St. James, Goose Creek in a position of determining how to realize the economic potential of its property while at the same time protecting the intact church building and the remains of the associated buildings as well as any possible undiscovered archaeological sites.

The South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology's role in this planning process began in May 1986 with a call from Eugene N. Zeigler, Office of the Chancellor, Diocese of South Carolina. Zeigler contacted Dr. Bruce E. Rippeteau, SCIAA Director, about the possibilities for conducting an archaeological survey of the St. James Church property.

Preliminary discussions continued between various members of both parties until June 3, 1986, when Bishop Allison, in a letter to Dr. Rippeteau, requested a written proposal outlining the scope and cost of an archaeological reconnaissance survey of the St. James property. A proposal to perform the requested survey was forwarded to the Diocese July 9, 1986. This proposal was accepted and signed February 10, 1987. Fieldwork began February 16 and was completed March 6, 1987.

Survey Location

The survey area lies at the north end and on the east side of the Goose Creek Reservoir, just south of the community of Goose Creek in Berkeley County, South Carolina. This tract of land consists of approximately four hundred acres.

Approximately one-third of this tract consists of marsh and low wetland hardwoods lying east of and adjacent to Goose Creek. East of these wetlands, the land rises to form a
landforms is a narrow ecotone that makes up approximately one-quarter of the total church property. This landform is a relatively narrow strip that runs in a north/south direction. It is bordered on the west by Goose Creek Swamp and on the east by County Road S-8-809, with the exception of a small area near the north end of the property. This small area extends across County Road S-8-809 toward the east, where it terminates at the property line near present day County Road S-8-37 (Red Bank Road). Two small unnamed branches that border this small tract act as north/south boundaries. The rest of the church property lies east of these county roads and are typical Coastal Plain pine flats with only slightly undulating poorly drained soils.
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Berkeley County Location

Berkeley County is in the southeastern part of South Carolina on the Atlantic Coastal Plain (Fig. 1). The county has a total area of about 775,000 acres, or 1,211 square miles. This acreage includes Lake Moultrie, about 60,800 acres; the 10,000 acres of Lake Marion; and other smaller water areas totaling 7,775 acres. The county seat is Moncks Corner, the second largest town in the county (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).

Berkeley County was created in 1882 from the Charleston District, with Mt. Pleasant as the county seat. In 1895 a section of Berkeley County bordering the coast was added to Charleston County, and the county seat was moved to Moncks Corner (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).

About 8% of the county is used for cultivated crops, 2% for pasture, 83% for woodland, and 7% for urban and other nonfarm uses. The principal crops are corn and soybeans, but a few acres are in cotton and tobacco. Forest products are a major source of income (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).

Physiography, Drainage, and Geology of Berkeley County

Berkeley County is mainly made up of one broad physiographic area, the Atlantic Coast flatwoods. The soils are sedimentary and were transported from other areas by the ocean or streams and were deposited in their present location (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).

Most of the county consists of broad areas of nearly level to gently sloping, dominantly loamy and clayey soils. The soils on the floodplains of the rivers and smaller streams are subject to frequent flooding. The major soils in the county are in the Meggett, Goldsboro, Bonneau, Craven, Wahee, Duplin, Bethera, and Tawcaw series. Ninety-five percent of the soils in Berkeley County have excess water in profile (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).

The central and southern parts of the county are drained by the Cooper River and its tributaries. In these areas the soils are predominantly nearly level to gently sloping but are steeply sloping in areas adjacent to streams and drainageways. Soils in this area are moderately well drained to very poorly drained (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).

The elevation of Berkeley County ranges from a high of about 105 feet above sea level in the Catons Bay area in the western part of the county to sea level on Daniels Island at the intersection of the Cooper and Wando Rivers (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).
Figure 1: Site location.
Geology of the St. James Church Properties Near Goose Creek

The St. James Church properties near Goose Creek are located on the Talbot terrace. The Talbot terrace is late Pleistocene in age and was created during a warm interglacial period that caused earth’s glaciers to melt. Subsequently, earth’s oceans rose and formed beaches, or terraces. The Talbot terrace represents one of these ancient beaches (Cooke 1936). The Talbot terrace lies in a general north/south direction in the vicinity of Goose Creek and is bordered on the east and west by the Pamlico terrace. The Pamlico terrace is somewhat lower in elevation than the Talbot and includes the Goose Creek reservoir and adjacent swamplands. Elevation of the church properties within the Talbot terrace is approximately 30 feet (USGS Ladson SC Topographic Map 1958).

The soil associations in Berkeley County have been grouped into four general kinds of landscape for broad interpretative purposes. An association typically consists of one or more soils and some minor soils. It is named for the major soils. Soils of the St. James Church properties are Wahee-Duplin-Lenoir. Local soils within this group are Bonneau loamy sand (BoA), Craven loam (CvB), Duplin fine sandy loam (DuA), Lucy loamy sand (LuB), Megget loam (Mg), and Ocilla loamy fine sand (Oc) (U.S.) Department of Agriculture 1980).

Hydrology of Goose Creek

The Goose Creek area lies within the Ashley-Cooper River Sub-Basin. This sub-basin lies within the lower Coastal Plain province. Six major aquifer systems underlie the sub-basin and include the Middendorf, Black Creek, Peedee, Black Mingo, Tertiary Limestone, and Shallow Aquifer Systems (South Carolina State Water Assessment 1983).

The city of Charleston owns the Goose Creek Reservoir, from which it obtains municipal and industrial water supplies. Originally tidally influenced, the stream was impounded for the storage of freshwater (South Carolina State Water Assessment 1983). Goose Creek drains into the Cooper River, a tidally influenced river that discharges into the Charleston Harbor.

Climate

Berkeley County has a subtropical climate, with warm summers, mild winters, and ample precipitation. Except in summer, when maritime tropical air persists in the area for extended periods, the day-to-day weather is largely controlled by the generally west to east motion of pressure systems and fronts. Rainfall averages about 47 inches per year and ranges from 39 to 55 inches 6 years in 10 (South Carolina Water Assessment 1983).

Summer is long, warm and moist. Maximum daily temperatures hover near or above 90° Fahrenheit, and minimum daily temperatures range from 65° to 70°. Temperatures in excess of 100° are usually recorded a few days each year; the highest during the period of record, 106°, was recorded in August 1954 (South Carolina Water Assessment 1983).

Winter is short, mild, and relatively dry, accounting for only about 20% of the average annual precipitation. Average daily maximum and minimum temperatures are about 60° and 35°, respectively, yielding an average winter temperature of about 48°. The
coldest temperature during the period of record, 4, was recorded in February 1973 (South Carolina Water Assessment 1983).

Flora

To date no general in-depth study of South Carolina flora has been done. Floral studies have all been of regional or local nature and usually were conducted to address a particular need or field of interest. None had been conducted in the Goose Creek section of Berkeley County. This is not to imply that nothing is known of the local flora.

In a general sense, the lower Coastal Plain that includes the Goose Creek area, falls into the potentially oak-hickory dominant forest pattern of Southeastern North America (Shelford 1963). If left undisturbed they will ultimately evolve into oak-hickory dominant forests, but at this point timbering, farming and development have upset this balance.

Within this broad classification there exists considerable diversity of flora. The lower Coastal Plain of South Carolina that includes the immediate area of Goose Creek is one of relatively little but significant land relief. This generally flat region with its sandy sterile soils are ideal for the growth of pine forest and is usually dominated by various species of these trees. This pine dominance can probably be attributed to several factors. The soils themselves are conducive to their needs; the great frequency of fires in these flatlands is also a contributor, because pines are among the first species of trees to reestablish after fire or other land disturbance. All these factors probably contribute to the pine dominance of these flatlands in exception to the oak-hickory dominance of most relatively undisturbed lands (Shelford 1963).

Although land relief is slight within these flatlands, ecotone systems are created within these areas by numerous small creeks, branches, and depressions. Where these ecosystems are present there is considerable variability of vegetation. These landforms, although varying only slightly in elevation, are usually populated by vegetative communities having distinct differences and needs. To generalize, there are three basic ecological systems dominant in the area of survey: these are the wetlands and the adjacent swamps; the higher flatland elevations; and the ecotone slopes that separate them.

The low wetlands/swamps are dominated by cypress, gum, and tupelo forest typical of those throughout the Southeastern Coastal Plain (Shelford 1963). Other moister, tolerant species are present as well, such as willow, laurel, water oak, and red maple.

The ecotone area that lies between the wet lowlands and the higher flatlands are dominated by live oak, hickory, large remnant pines, magnolia, holly, beech, white and red oak, hackberry and sweetgum (Shelford 1963).

The flatlands are predominantly pine, with lesser amounts of sweetgum in wet areas. The understory in these flats is predominantly wax myrtle.

Fauna

The Goose Creek area is becoming thickly populated with people and has lost much of the diversity of its former wild game population. When the first Europeans arrived in the area they no doubt found an abundance of game, fish and foul. The many species would most certainly have included bear, cougar, wolves, and, possibly, occasional elk and bison. Of these animals, today only the black bear remains, and these in drastically
reduced numbers. It is not likely that any are to be found in the immediate vicinity of Goose Creek today; instead they are restricted to the more isolated swamps. Many of the smaller animals that existed at that time were able to adapt to the pressures of a human population, and are today still quite abundant. Among these animals are the white tailed deer, opossum, rabbit, squirrel, fox, otter, raccoon, beaver, bobcat, and perhaps the mink and muskrat.

A number of species of reptiles are present in the survey area. Snake species include the diamondback, canebreak, and probably the pigmy rattlesnake, the copperhead, cottonmouth, and several other species of water snakes as well as grass snakes. Turtles that frequent both the wetlands and higher land areas are common, and it is likely that alligators exist in the nearby Goose Creek Reservoir, although none were observed.

Local birdlife is abundant, but probably differs in number and kinds of species seen today as opposed to those observed during the early colonization period. Birds that played an important role as a food source of the Indian and early European settlers such as the turkey, partridge, ducks, and geese are today seldom seen in populated areas. The most common local birds today are various species of songbirds, many of which have adapted to the encroachment of civilization. Other birds observed within the survey area were hawks, owls, vultures, crows, and ospreys.
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Paleoindian Period

At a yet undetermined time prior to 12,000 years ago, perhaps as early as 20,000 years ago, nomadic Asian people made their way onto the North American Continent (Griffin 1967) by way of a land bridge that connected Asian Siberia with the state of Alaska. This land bridge, now covered by the waters of the Bering Strait, had been alternately exposed and inundated by the rising and falling of the earth's seas. This fluctuation of sea levels is caused by alternating periods of cooling and warming of the earth's atmosphere. During periods of extreme cold, known as glacial periods, enormous quantities of the earth's sea waters were solidified in the form of thick ice caps that form at the earth's poles. The creation of these vast ice formations lowered the earth's seas to levels determined by the length and severity of cold. During the most recent "Ice Age," the Wisconsin, which began approximately 70,000 years ago and ended approximately 11,000 years ago (Pewe and Hopkins 1965), oceans receded to a point several hundred feet below their present stage, thereby exposing large areas of the earth formally inundated by oceans and creating a land bridge between Asian Siberia and the state of Alaska. The land bridge was in existence during most of the Wisconsin Glaciation (though it was probably temporarily closed during the Woronzofian transgression, about 33,000-45,000 years ago [Pewe and Hopkins 1965]) and remained available to migrating plants, animals, and humans until it was resubmerged by the rising sea level about 11,000 years ago (Pewe and Hopkins 1965).

It is unclear whether the first Americans came in small groups over an extended period of time or emigrated in more intense, short term migrations. The catalyst for this migration is speculative, but perhaps these early people followed game herds that also migrated across the Bering Strait.

By 9,000 years ago these early inhabitants had spread across North America and most of Central and South America (Griffin 1967). This spreading over such a vast land area by that early date is but one of numerous arguments for man's arrival in the New World at a much earlier date than currently accepted by most archaeologists. Archaeological research in recent years has produced a number of earlier carbon 14 dates (Old Crow Flats, Yukon, 25,750 +/−1,800-1,500; Santa Rosa Island, California, 11,000 to 37,000; Muaco, Falcon, Venezuela, 14,300 ± 500 and 16,375 ± 400; and Los Toldos, Santa Cruz, Argentina, 12,666 ± 600, to name but a few) from prehistoric sites, but no conclusive evidence has been obtained to substantiate man's arrival before 12,000 years ago. That these nomadic people could so rapidly disperse over both the North and South American continents seems remarkable. If we assume that they ventured only 10 miles farther each year from their point of entrance where the land bridge touched Alaska, then in 1,000 years they could have traveled 10,000 miles. When considered from this standpoint the feat appears less impressive and more credible. The catalyst for this dispersion to most parts of the two continents is debatable, but it is likely these small groups, unencumbered by permanent settlements or obligations to a large population, simply followed the game herds, depending on them for a substantial portion of their subsistence. Paleoindian's use of these now extinct animals such as mammoth, mastodon, camel, horse, tapir, bison and ground sloth has been documented in the American Southwest (Wormington 1957 ). But like most primitive people they probably utilized not only megafauna but any obtainable foods to supplement their diet.

No direct association of Paleoindian and these extinct animal species has been made in South Carolina, although the animal fossil remains are found here (Drayton 1802: 39;
Michie 1976; Wright 1976). It is likely that these animals and Paleoindians in South Carolina co-existed, as their counterparts in the American Southwest.

In South Carolina, no archaeological sites have been found that represent a pure Paleoindian site. The archaeological community bases the assumption, that these early people were in South Carolina, on typological similarities of stone tools found here with those found at archaeological sites in other states where reasonably reliable occupation dates have been established. Such sites include Blackwater Draw in New Mexico with contexts radiocarbon dated to 9220 B.C. (Sellers 1952); the Dent Site in Colorado with contexts radiocarbon dated to 9200 B.C. (Agogina and Rovner 1964); and the Dumbeo Site in Oklahoma, with contexts radiocarbon dated to 9200 B.C. (Leonhardt 1966). The Nacho and Lehner sites in Arizona have also provided dates in the range of 11,000-12,000 years ago (Haury et al. 1959). These tools are characterized by lanceolate stone projectile points/knives with a distinctive flute, that is, thinning flakes removed from each side beginning at the base and extending towards the tip. This fluting better facilitated hafting, or attaching the point/knife to a shaft. Paleoindian tools are further characterized by grinding the lateral and basal edges in the area of hafting. This grinding dulls the edges of the tool and reduces cutting the materials used to lash the point/knife to the shaft. Well made unifacial tools, for working wood, bone, and hide, are another technological expression of the Paleoindians. But because the manufacture of these tool types continued into the Archaic period they cannot, by themselves, be identified to either the Paleoindian or Archaic period.

Paleoindian fluted points/knives have been found and recorded in every county in South Carolina with the exception of Calhoun County (Michie 1977; Charles 1981). Their distribution, although broad, is sparse, represented by only 311 recorded finds, only 2 of which were recovered from context. One was excavated from archaeological site 38AK4 in Aiken County, and the other from 38AN8, in Anderson County.

An argument has been made that Paleoindians in South Carolina occupied predominantly the Coastal Plain and preferred settlement along major rivers and streams (Michie 1977). Michie based his theory on all the data available at that time, a total of 100 Paleoindian points/knives recorded from South Carolina. Michie's theory may ultimately prove true, but the recording of an additional 211 of these Paleo artifacts since Michie's research indicate this theory may not be conclusive. It is true that twice as many Paleo points/knives have been recovered from the Coastal Plain as from the Piedmont. But the Coastal Plain has twice the land area of the Piedmont. On a per-square-mile basis the frequencies of Paleo point/knives are roughly equal in both the Coastal Plain and Piedmont (Charles 1981). Relatively few Paleo points/knives are able to be plotted in the exact location where they were found, but based on the general areas of recovery of such artifacts, approximately as many have been recovered from interriverine areas as from areas near rivers. Plotting these Paleoindian artifacts on a topographical map of South Carolina indicate no definitive settlement patterns oriented predominantly toward riverine or inter­riverine environments.

The basis for interpreting Paleoindian occupation of South Carolina is perhaps biased not only by a small artifact sample size but also by problematic recovery methods. A majority of our data has come from collectors whose choice of areas to survey is generally limited to those of high visibility, i.e. shores of lakes, plowed fields, eroded areas, and tidal river banks along the immediate coast and newly cleared land. In recent years hobby divers have expanded these survey areas to include river bottoms. Data from areas having less visibility, such as forest lands, are obviously lacking. With this understood, the apparent high frequency of points/knives occurring on riverine sites of the Coastal Plain...
would seem biased data for suggesting settlement patterns. It may reflect instead simply the survey methods of collectors responding in part to our settlement patterns and land use.

In Berkeley County 15 Paleo points/knives have been recorded, most were recovered from the beaches of Lake Moultrie or recovered by divers from the Cooper River. None have been recorded in the immediate vicinity of the St. James Church (Michie 1977; Charles 1981).

The paucity of Paleoindian data, and its biased recovery, severely limits interpretation of South Carolina's first inhabitants. If these problems persist, our knowledge of this intriguing epoch will remain speculative.

Archaic Period

As the Pleistocene period ended approximately 10,000 years ago it also signaled the ending of a cultural period in North and South America that archaeologists have named the Paleo period. This change was not simultaneous throughout North and South America, continuing until a later date in some areas, but generally speaking the Paleo period was over (Griffin 1967). The intense cold of the Pleistocene period gave way to a warming trend. At this time, the polar ice caps and mountain glaciers associated with the Pleistocene were retreating. This melting of ice raised the earth's seas close to their present levels. The world's biological changes kept pace with these climatic changes, and soon the semiboreal forests were replaced with northern hardwoods, oak and hickory. These changes also marked the end of numerous species of animals, particularly large animals such as the mammoth and mastodon. These changes continued until approximately 5,000 years ago. By that time the earth's forests and probably its animal life resembled that found by the first European explorers of the New World.

Adaptation to postglacial environments effected major changes in the lifeways of Native Americans. Unlike the preceding Paleoindian period, with its apparent uniformity of tool technology and subsistence patterns that spread throughout most or all of North America, the Archaic period was a time of change and regional adaptation. These changes are evidenced by changes in settlement patterns, implement technology and subsistence strategies. The progression of the Archaic culture has been sufficiently outlined to distinguish three stages: the Early, Middle and Late (Griffin 1967).

The earliest expression of change from the Paleoindian period to the Archaic period manifests itself in a change in technology in the manufacture of stone tools. Lanceolate points/knives gave way to points having notches chipped into the lateral edges of the blade at a point near its base. The reason for this change is unclear, but perhaps it allowed for better hafting. Another change was resharpennig these tools by removing flakes from along only one side of the blade, as opposed to both sides. This method did two things: it conserved raw materials and recreated a sharp edge. This process removed only half the amount of stone as the previous method. The removal of flakes from only one side of the blade caused the blade to have a beveled or twisted shape, a distinctive technological characteristic that, in the Southeast, occurs only in the Early Archaic period, making it a reliable cultural marker for identifying Early Archaic occupations.

Also abandoned at this time was the practice of notching the point/knife and grinding the blade edges in the area of hafting (Coe 1964). Replacing these beveled, side or corner notched blades with ground bases were blades with stem fashioned in the center of its basal end, giving them a "Christmas tree"-like symmetry. Occasionally these stems were ground but most often they were not. In some areas these stems were bifurcated, that
is, they had a rather deep notch chipped in the end of the stem, creating a divided stem. This appears to have been no more than a technological expression representative of the time (Broyles 1971).

Stone unifacial tools designed for scraping hides or working wood and bone remained virtually unchanged from the earlier Paleoindian period.

The few Early Archaic sites excavated by archaeologists that have produced well preserved faunal remains indicate a reliance on animals, primarily Odocoileus virginianus (white-tailed deer), as a subsistence base. This has been substantiated through the work of Dejarnette at the Stanfield-Worley Bluff shelter (Dejarnette et al. 1962), of Weigel at Russel Cave (Weigel et al. 1974), and of Adovasio at Meadowcroft (Adovasio et al. 1978).

The transition from the Early Archaic to the Middle Archaic period is expressed primarily by a change in tool technology, site preference, and an increase in numbers of artifacts recovered from sites. Points/knives were now being fashioned in a lanceolate form once again. However, these lanceolate points/knives are easily distinguished from the earlier Paleoindian lanceolate points/knives. Those from Middle Archaic were thick and crudely formed with rounded or slightly tapered stemmed bases. Grinding of the hafting area was seldom done. The well-made scrapers, so common during the Paleoindian and the Early Archaic periods, ceased to be used during the Middle and Late Archaic periods in southeastern North America (Coe 1964).

Scatters of stone tools left by these Middle Archaic people indicate intensified occupation, which may reflect an increase in population. The areas where they are found in greatest abundance indicate they had a preference for interriverine landforms as places of occupation. This may reflect a greater dependance on food sources found in those environments, such as acorns, hickory nuts and other vegetable matter.

It is not until late in the Archaic period that a marked increase in diversity of prehistoric cultural materials is seen. This increase is evidenced by the appearance of ground and carved stone implements, such as axes and steatite bowls and cooking stones.

Also, a greater dependance on shellfish as a dietary supplement along the coast and some inland rivers is seen (Crusoe 1974; Ford 1966; Willey 1966 et al.). In these areas the Indians left numerous and often large deposits of shellfish remains. Those along the coast consist mostly of oyster, clam, whelk and periwinkle. Those of the interior rivers consist of freshwater mussel shell. Both contain well preserved skeletal remains of animals consumed by the Indians (Stoltman 1974; Marrinam 1975; DePratter 1976; Trinkley 1980).

These shell middens create an alkaline condition not generally found in the moist South Carolina soils. This alkalinity protects organic materials such as bone from rapid decay and has allowed archaeologists an opportunity to learn more about the Indians' diet and their use of bone than would otherwise be possible (Claflin 1931; Trinkley 1980). Found within these shell middens are bone awls and sometimes elaborately carved bone pins. Perhaps tools such as these were used throughout the Archaic and even during the Paleoindian period (Griffin 1967; Smith 1986).

During the Late Archaic period lithic technology once again changed. Points/knives evolved from a thick lanceolate form into large, flat, relatively crude stemmed forms that were made, in most cases, by simple percussion. These tools were broad in relation to their thickness and the blade edges were seldom retouched to produce a fine edge. Although some variability of size, form, and degree of craftsmanship occurs over its range of
distribution, it basically reflects craftsmanship decidedly inferior to most points/knives preceding it (Coe 1964; Charles 1981).

A marked increase in the ratio of drill/perforators to points/knives occurs during the Late Archaic period. Most of these were apparently made by resharpening the points/knives until they were no longer functional, at which time they continued to be used as drill/perforators (Coe 1964; Charles 1981).

This first clay pottery found along the coastal areas of southeastern North America occurs during the Late Archaic period and dates to approximately 4,500 years ago (DePratter 1979; South 1973; Trinkley 1980). It was rather thick and, as a rule, not finely made. The temper consisted of plant fibers. The earliest forms of this pottery were undecorated (Fairbanks 1942; Holmes 1903; Waring 1939). It is often found in association with shell middens but not exclusively. The manufacture of clay vessels in the Piedmont area did not begin at such an early date. In the Piedmont, the use of steatite, carved into vessels, continued into the Woodland period, probably for some time before it was replaced by clay vessel manufacturing.

This undecorated form of clay pottery soon evolved, and may have coexisted for a time with a form having simple punctate decorations. These decorations were made by pressing with reeds; sticks, shell or fingernail. The fiber temper continued to be used. This punctate method of surface decoration continued until approximately 3,000 B.P. by which time sand had replaced fiber in tempering pottery.

Woodland Period

The Woodland period began in the Southeast approximately 3,000 years ago (DePratter, personal communication 1987; Griffin 1967; Willey 1966; Smith 1986) and lasted until approximately 1,300 B.P.

The Woodland period was a time of considerable increase in quantity and diversity of material goods. We see a greater trend toward localization of artifact types. This localization is most evident in the points/knives of the period (Griffin 1967; Smith 1986; Charles 1981). Numerous types, or shapes, were being made. The areal distribution of some forms was limited to areas no larger than a few counties. Size is inconsistent but in most cases smaller than the preceding points/knives of the Late Archaic period. At approximately 1,500 B.P. small triangular arrow points were being made, indicating the first use of the bow and arrow.

Pottery of the Woodland period becomes more diverse in form, temper and decoration. This variability of surface decoration, form and temper serves as reasonably reliable cultural markers throughout the Woodland period. The earlier fiber temper was replaced by sand, grit, shell, and crushed pottery fragments (Trinkley 1980; South 1973; Anderson 1982). Decorative motifs became more complex and were accomplished by various methods such as the previously mentioned punctate and finger pinched designs in the earlier forms to those decorated by cord, fabric, and net impressions. Others were decorated by stamping the pot surface with a paddle carved with checks. This method of stamping with carved paddles evolved into elaborate designs consisting of curves, circles, and intricate lines and combinations of both late in the Woodland period. Plain and burnished pottery was also made.
Pipes, for smoking tobacco, made of clay or carved from steatite or clorite schist, were being made. Burial mounds and semipermanent villages were constructed.

The Woodland Indians continued to make use of the shellfish along the coast and to a degree the inland rivers. Hunting and gathering continued as in the Archaic period but cultigens were becoming an increasingly important source of food (Smith 1986; Griffin 1967). Important cultigens in the Eastern United States were gourd, squash, sumpweed, bean, maygrass, Chenopodium and Iva annua (Ford 1978). The increase of cultigens probably decreased reliance on hunting as the major method of subsistence and perhaps brought a degree of sedentism, previously unknown to aboriginals.

Mississippian Period

The Mississippian period, or the South Appalachian Mississippian regional complex as it is known in the southeastern United States (Ferguson 1971; Smith 1986), began approximately 1,300 years ago and ended shortly after the arrival of Europeans into the Southeast (Willey 1966; Griffin 1967; Smith 1986).

Based on archaeological remains, the Mississippian period was a time when the American Indians reached their cultural zenith. Agricultural technologies had reached a point where large tracts of corn and other cultigens were cultivated. They had also devised means to store large quantities of their harvest for the winter. Large scale harvests and storage facilities attest to Mississippian sedentism. These agricultural abilities allowed them to escape the hunter/gatherer subsistence pattern and perhaps dictated the need to construct large, permanent villages to accommodate an expanding population.

Some of the larger villages were usually constructed near the fertile floodplains along major rivers and streams. These flatlands adjacent to rivers were periodically inundated with floodwaters that replenished nutrients removed by farming. These floodplains were essential for the welfare of these large populations. The villages were often fortified with palisaded walls that probably indicated an increase in hostilities between populations (DePratter 1983; Smith 1986), perhaps warring over these desirable lands.

Sedentism, brought about by the transformation from a hunting/gathering society to one based on agrarian subsistence, allowed for an increase in the production of non-essential goods. The relative importance of mobility to a hunting/gathering society would by necessity limit the amount of goods curated by that society. This appears to have been of little consideration to sedentary populations, as evidenced by comparison of archaeological remains found on Late Archaic and Mississippian period sites. The Mississippian period was a time of impressive accomplishments. Large flat topped temple mounds were constructed of earth. These impressive, large mounds were sometimes associated with smaller burial mounds in a complex covering many acres. Mississippian society appears to have been more structured than preceding ones, with well developed social, political and religious systems (Willey 1966; Ferguson 1971).

Pottery of the period became increasingly larger. Surface decorations became more elaborate and were generally applied by pressing the wet clay with a paddle that had been carved with elaborate motifs of circles, rectangles and other symmetrical designs. Free hand incising was another method of decoration. Plain and burnished forms were also made. Rims were sometimes decorated by the applications of clay strips and nodes. Reed punctations near the rim were also common. Temper used in these vessels consisted of a variety of materials that included sand, shell, and occasionally plant fibers (South 1976;
Ferguson 1974). These vessels were used for cooking, storage and often for burying the dead.

The most visible expression of the Mississippian culture in South Carolina occurs in the Santee River drainage system. This is exemplified by an impressive complex of earthen mounds near the town of Camden in Kershaw County. Two of the better known mounds are Mulberry Mound (38KE12) and Adamson Mound (38KE11). Fort Watson Mound (38CR1) is located farther south on the east of Lake Marion in Clarendon County near the town of Santee. One mound, and possibly more, were inundated by the construction of Lake Wateree just north of the town of Camden. The Broad River, which joins the Congaree, which joins the Wateree to form the Santee, has two recorded mounds on its east bank. One of these is the McCollum Mound (38CS2) located in Chester County near the town of Lockhart. The other is the Blair Mound (38FA48) located in Fairfield County. This mound is now inundated as a result of the recent construction of Lake Monticello.

Impressive as these mounds are, the Indians and their associated village sites cannot compare with those of the Mississippian River Valley in the midwest and some other areas in the Southeast. Perhaps if the Europeans had not arrived when they did these people might ultimately have reached the population density of their counterparts to the west and rivaled their cultural achievements. This was not to be. Their way of life collapsed shortly after the coming of the Europeans who introduced them to disease and exploited them economically. By the mid-eighteenth century the Indians of South Carolina's Coastal Plain had ceased to have a distinct cultural identity.

Protohistoric Period

Between the years 1562 and 1576 the Indian population of coastal South Carolina between the Savannah and Santee Rivers was said to be approximately 1,750. The interior between the coast and the fall line was largely uninhabited. These small coastal tribes banded together along the coast in summer where they grew small plots of vegetables and fished and hunted. In the winter they split into small family units and moved inland from the coast, seldom venturing more than 80 miles away from the coast. Several small tribes were recorded as being in areas nearby the St. James Church: the Wando, from which the Wando River acquired its name, lived near that river; the Etiwan occupied an area along the lower Cooper River; the Santee Indians lived near the Santee River in the upper area of Berkeley County (Waddell 1980).

In 1716 a small band of Kiawah was living north of Wappoola Creek in Berkeley County, on or near what may have been Mulberry Plantation. In 1724 forty members of the Etiwan tribe were living in Saint Johns Parish in Berkeley County. The exact location, however, is unknown. From this time on, these people were gradually assimilated into the general population; they soon lost their Kiawah and Etiwan tribal identity (Waddell 1980).
CULTURAL SEQUENCE OF HUMAN OCCUPATION IN THE
LOWER COASTAL PLAIN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHRONOLOGY</th>
<th>CULTURAL SEQUENCE</th>
<th>SUBSISTENCE METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Agriculture; hunting and gathering; trade with European settlers; demise of Indian culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>South Appalachian</td>
<td>Large scale agriculture; continued hunting and gathering; shellfish extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>Hunting and gathering; shellfish extraction; probable agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Middle Woodland</td>
<td>Hunting and gathering; shellfish extraction; horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Early Woodland</td>
<td>Hunting and gathering; shellfish extraction; possible agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Hunting and gathering; coastal and riverine shellfish extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Middle Archaic</td>
<td>Hunting and gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
<td>Hunting and gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000 +</td>
<td>Paleoindian</td>
<td>Hunting and gathering; probable emphasis on big game.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORIC OVERVIEW OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Since an in-depth discussion of all of the important issues affecting South Carolina's development would necessarily fill several volumes, only an overview of the history of South Carolina will be presented here. The references cited herein can be used as a guide to more in-depth study of the issues in question.

The history of South Carolina can be broken down, roughly, into five major periods. These are the Exploratory period, the Proprietary period, the Colonial period, the antebellum Federal period, and the postbellum Federal period.

Early exploration and attempted settlement of the geographic area now known as South Carolina was made by both the Spanish and French in the sixteenth century. Good discussions of these attempts can be found in Kovacik and Winberry (1986), Lyon (1984), Quinn (1971), and Jones (1971).

South Carolina's first permanent European settlers arrived in 1670 (Wallace 1951:28). The colony was settled under the auspices of the Lords Proprietors, a group of Englishmen that gained the favor of King Charles II by supporting his bid to regain power during the period of Cromwell's rule of England (Wallace 1951:22). In return King Charles gave them dominion over the area between the 31st and 36th parallels from coast to coast (Wallace 1951:24). The original bounds of the colony included most of what is now North and South Carolina, Georgia, and northern Florida.

Many of the original settlers of South Carolina were planters from Barbados and other West Indies Islands (Jones 1971:20). These islands, settled as much as 50 years earlier, were facing increasing population pressures by the 1670s as their plantation agricultural system prospered and required more slaves. Thus there was a lack of land and opportunities, particularly for released indentured servants and second sons (Jones 1971:21). The opening of the South Carolina colony allowed a release for these pressures. There were, in addition, settlers from a number of other sources, but none more influential in the early years (Jones 1871:26).

The Barbadian settlers of South Carolina brought with them a well-developed system of plantation agriculture based on the use of black and Indian slaves (Wood 1974:7, 24; Wallace 1951:38). Initially slaves were used in a variety of ways—-as pioneers, boatsmen, woodsmen, cattle herders, and hunters, among other occupations. After the discovery of rice agriculture slave occupations were oriented more toward purely agricultural pursuits, although it should be noted that slaves performed numerous tasks throughout the period of slavery (Wood 1974:23, 30, 95-130).

The early years of the colony were characterized by experimentation and the search for a staple crop that would allow South Carolina to "take off" economically (Clowse 1971:69). The introduction of large scale rice production provided this impetus for economic growth. Combined with the sale of timber products, skins, and livestock, South Carolina's viability as a colony was insured (Clowse 1971:132-138). This is not to say that there were not ups and downs, but generally speaking after the 1690s the survival of the colony was never in serious question.

With the introduction of rice agriculture, ever increasing numbers of slaves were imported to work the fields (Clowse 1971:131). By 1708 blacks outnumbered whites in the
colony (Clowse 1971:252). Twenty years later there were over twice as many blacks as whites in the colony (Clowse 1971:252). The presence of these slaves is considered by many to be the major factor shaping the cultural development of South Carolina. Material contributions easily visible include contributions to the language (both gullah for blacks and the distinctive lowcountry accent of whites), foodways, crafts, and folklore of the state. Less easily measured are the contributions made in the areas of agriculture, work habits, and in very abstract terms, the attitude and psychological orientation of the ruling race (these themes are found in any number of recent secondary works including Oakes [1982], Wood [1974], Genovese [1974], Littlefield [1983], Dunn [1972], and Winberry and Kovacik [1986], among others).

The period of rule by the Lords Proprietors ended in 1719 (Bargar 1970:1). Problems with their administration caused the settlers to petition for relief from the royal government. Their complaints included, among other things, high taxes, the lack of adequate defense of the colony by the proprietary government, a denial of representation in the decision making processes that governed their lives, and the denial of their rights under English common law (Wallace 1951:99-105; Barger 1970:3).

The rule of the royal government was more equitable, but nevertheless was considered too repressive in the long run, and lasted only six years longer than the rule of the proprietors. The financial encouragement in the form of bounties for naval stores and indigo, and the efforts of the crown in the area of defense, allowed the colony to grow at a slow but constant rate throughout the Colonial period. The adoption of the township system (Wallace 1951:146) encouraged farmers to settle in the interior of the colony (the backcountry), both within the townships themselves, and in the surrounding areas. Thus a buffer between the Indians and the plantations of the lowcountry was provided, allowing the frontier to be slowly pushed back until, by the time of the Revolution, the aboriginal inhabitants of the state were mostly confined to the extreme fringes of the state (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:81).

The settlement of the backcountry allowed the relative percentages of blacks and whites in the population to equalize somewhat by the 1770s (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:77). A British type class system in which the wealthy had power and the poor were oppressed prevailed in South Carolina. This was the source of much conflict between the poor inhabitants of the backcountry and the wealthy planters of the lowcountry. Backcountry whites were forced to travel to Charleston to vote (if they could pass the property requirements), to bring charges against a thief or sue a debtor, yet they were expected to pay taxes and serve in the militia at the pleasure of the aristocrats (Jones 1971:92,93).

The ten years prior to the Revolution were a period in which the sheer numbers of the backcountrymen and the threat that an uprising represented forced the General Assembly to recognize them and their problems, and give them some degree of enfranchisement. It was not until well past the end of the Revolution that more or less full enfranchisement was effected (Jones 1971:117).

The American Revolution in South Carolina (a good summary can be found in Jones [1971:103-115]) was fairly quiet until 1779. Savannah was taken as a base of operations in December of 1778 and the British soon took control of the posts on the Savannah River as far inland as Augusta. When the American army under General Benjamin Lincoln moved to retake Augusta, the British under General Augustine Prevost attacked Charleston. Prevost's troops could in fact have taken the city, but the force under his control would have been too small to hold it when Lincoln returned, so he was forced to retreat.
After a joint attempt by the French and Americans to recapture Savannah failed, the British moved on Charleston in force and captured the city along with the entire American army in February of 1780 after a three month siege. With Charleston subjugated, the remainder of South Carolina was easily controlled for awhile. An American army under General Horatio Gates suffered a defeat at Camden and then retired to North Carolina. There, the command of the army was taken over by General Nathanael Greene.

Cornwallis considered Greene's army too weak to be of consequence, and after a few minor engagements the main force of the British army moved out of the state in an attempt to catch the main force of the American army under General Washington in Virginia. Greene's army engaged Cornwallis' troops on a number of occasions (Camden and Guilford Courthouse were the largest battles) and managed to weaken them to the point that Cornwallis was forced to fall back to the safe haven of Wilmington, North Carolina and to rest, recuperate and resupply before continuing their march to Virginia through hostile territory. There, in the fall of 1781 Cornwallis' army was defeated and captured. With the capture of Cornwallis' army the large scale fighting of the Revolution ended.

Meanwhile in South Carolina the occupying force was being harassed by partisan militia and the American army. Although there were no resounding triumphs the steady attrition exacted by the Americans led the British to narrow their occupied area steadily until by the close of 1781 they controlled only the immediate vicinity of Charleston. Their position in Charleston remained tenable until they withdrew in December of 1782. The treaty of peace signed in 1783 marked the end of England's claims to the South Carolina colony and the beginning of a new era of home rule.

The antebellum Federal period was characterized by both a continuation of old ways and the adaptation of the state to its independence. This independence was a two-edged sword. On one hand it allowed the state the freedom to trade with whomever it saw fit, but on the other hand it caused the state to lose the bounties that made marginal crops such as indigo profitable. With the loss of the bounties on indigo and naval stores it became necessary for the South Carolina planters to find new crops.

The most important of these turned out to be cotton. The invention of the cotton gin, which separated the seeds from the fibers and thus allowed cotton to be shipped without rotting or being ruined by oil staining, made cotton a truly viable crop. This improved technology, paired with the development of improved strains of seed, a growing market (in England and the United States) for industrially produced cloth, and better transportation, allowed cotton to become the mainstay of the state's economy (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:89,90).

With this change in the orientation of agriculture, the uplands of the backcountry and the sea islands that had previously been considered relatively worthless became more coveted. Backcountry farmers became wealthy slave-owning planters. The opportunity to make large sums of money farming cotton provided the impetus for a massive outmigration of farmers in search of new land, since the methods of farming cotton used in South Carolina at that time resulted in the rapid depletion of the soil. For example: of the 47,204 free native South Carolinians in the United States in 1860, 40% had emigrated, most to the newly opened western territories of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:92).

Increasing friction over the issue of slavery and the rights of states to dictate their own internal affairs in contravention of federal laws led South Carolina into the Civil War in 1861. South Carolina saw relatively little action in the Civil War. The shelling of Fort Sumter, the capture of Port Royal, and Sherman's March stand out. Nevertheless, large
numbers of South Carolinian's fought and died in the Southern army, and the changes wrought by this conflict revolutionized the social structure of the state (Jones [1971:170-179] features a concise summary of the Civil War).

The agrarian economy of South Carolina was devastated by the Civil War. The emancipation of the black slaves of South Carolina had multifaceted effects. The foremost effect was that the plantation system of farming, with its reliance on large numbers of laborers working essentially for no pay was no longer possible. Thus, when planters were faced with paying wages to a work force that could no longer be effectively managed, many were unable to continue. Since slaves often represented the most valuable collateral that a planter owned, when they were freed, a planter's net worth (as well as the net worth of all property in the state) dropped substantially overnight, forcing many into bankruptcy (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:106).

To say that the effects of emancipation were all positive for blacks is also difficult. In fact, the best thing that one can say is that at least they were no longer physically enslaved. The system of tenant farming that replaced slavery offered little real freedom when one considers that tenants were legally bound to the land by a system that almost insured that tenants would remain in debt to the landowners (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:108). Freedom, for the first generations of freed slaves, offered more hope than results. Indeed it was not until the 1960s that steps toward a true equality for blacks were made.

Industrial development began to take the place of agriculture, especially in the back-country, early in the nineteenth century. After the Civil War the number of whites working for wages in industry began to rise sharply (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:112,114), although South Carolina has never developed the type of industrial base (that is to say "heavy" industries) prevalent in the northern United States.

Tenant farming slowly declined with the advent of mechanized farming, and many landless former tenants (especially, but not only blacks) migrated to industrial areas of the northern United States in the twentieth century. This outmigration was most prevalent in the 1910s through 1940s (Kovacik and Winberry 1986:124), but recent statistics indicate that this process is reversing as the industrial boom of the 1910s through the 1960s slows in the North and increases in the South. Twentieth century South Carolina still relies on agriculture, but along with the rest of the "New South" much of the economic activities are "goods and services" oriented more like the rest of the nation than the Old South.
HISTORIC OVERVIEW OF
ST. JAMES CHURCH IN GOOSE CREEK

St. James Church (Fig. 2) was the center of the Goose Creek community, so it is
natural that almost every issue that affected the community affected the church and is
reflected in its history. Being an integral part of the Goose Creek community, the church
perhaps was responsible more than any other institution for shaping attitudes in eighteenth
century Goose Creek.

Figure 2: St. James Church, west end, 38BR59.

The scope of the present investigation has not allowed for an adequate and
exhaustive program of historical research. Research into primary sources has not been
possible, although numerous letters from ministers, and indirect records of the church's
activities, are extant. The records of the church were apparently destroyed in the nineteenth
century so this source of information would appear to be closed (Dr. Edward F. Parker
1987: personal communication). Secondary sources are available, however (Waring 1909;
Heitzler 1983; Deas 1905; Dalcho 1820; and Thomas 1957), and this discussion is drawn
primarily from those.

European settlers arrived in Goose Creek as early as 1671 (Heitzler 1983:6). By 1706
all of the lands on Goose Creek and its tributaries were granted (Heitzler 1983:6). In 1705
the Reverend Mr. Samuel Thomas wrote that the parish contained "about 120 families. Most
of the inhabitants are of the profession of the Church of England, excepting about five
families of French protestants...Three families of Presbyterians, and two Anabaptists"
(Waring 1909:6). At the same time Thomas wrote "The number of heathen slaves in this
parish I suppose to be about two hundred, twenty of whom I observed to come constantly
to church and these and several others of them well understanding the English language and
can read." These passages illustrate several important points. The lack of Protestants illustrates the ongoing fight for power between supporters of the Church of England and the dissenters that characterized the early history of the colony (Wallace 1951:66-74). Teaching and converting slaves illustrates a belief that they were fully human, a view that was to be denied later (with increasing vehemence) as a justification for the continuation of slavery (Oakes 1982:xiv).

The first Church of England clergyman (on record) to hold services in Goose Creek was Reverend William Corbin. He arrived in the colony in 1700 and left in 1703. No other record of his activities exists (Waring 1909:5). Mr. Thomas came over in 1702 and preached in Goose Creek at "a small church built there" (Waring 1909:5). The location of this church is unknown. Historian H.A.M. Smith suggests (in Waring 1909) that it was probably within sight of, or in the same location as, the extant church. He admits that this is merely his inference, and based in no way upon fact or even tradition (Waring 1909:63). Reverend Thomas made note of this church in 1704 and stated that it was in place "several years before." Smith takes this to mean 12-15 years before, but again he states that this is merely his surmise (Waring 1909:63). There was probably a church in Goose Creek as early as around 1700, since this is when the first clergyman is known to have been stationed at Goose Creek. However, there is absolutely no evidence to corroborate the inference that this church was in the same location as the present church.

Mr. Thomas continued to hold services at Goose Creek until 1705 at which time he returned to England to fetch his family. Unfortunately he died immediately upon his return to South Carolina in 1706. At that time the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (hereafter the SPG), a missionary group of the Church of England, sent Reverend Dr. Francis LeJau, who stated soon after arriving that his parishioners were collecting materials for building a church and parsonage (Waring 1909:7). In 1706, Benjamin Godin donated a tract of 16 acres of land and a church, "probably of wood" (Waring 1909:7), was built. Four acres of land were donated by Arthur Middleton upon which a parsonage was erected (Waring 1909:67) at the same time. Since Waring states that the wooden church was "removed" prior to the building of the present church we can assume that it was on the same piece of land. The present church was begun in 1714 and dedicated in 1719 after the close of the Yemassee War (Waring 1909:42). The church doubtlessly saw some use before its dedication, but probably not a full scale use since the parish was largely depopulated because of the war (Heitzler 1983:47).

To briefly summarize the assembly of the present glebe lands of St. James Goose Creek: One hundred acres were donated by Benjamin Schenkingh in 1706, at about the same time sixteen acres were donated by Benjamin Godin, and four acres were donated by Arthur Middleton. Three hundred additional acres of the Godin tract were purchased by the parishioners of St. James Goose Creek from Charles Pinckney. One hundred acres were added to the glebe, and two hundred were appropriated for a school (Waring 1909:67). Finally, twelve acres were purchased from Arthur Middleton (grandson? of the Arthur Middleton mentioned above) in 1778 (Waring 1909:16). The 1970 plat of the property of St. James Goose Creek depicts a tract of 398.3 acres, which is about 32 acres less than Waring (1909) and Deas (1905) state that there should be. To clarify this discrepancy, a deed search for the property was conducted but no deeds were on record for the property. We must assume that the originals were in possession of the vestry and were destroyed at the same time as the rest of the church's records, since the original of the plat for the Schenkingh property was in church hands in 1909 (Waring 1909:7). Regardless of the fate of these records the ownership of the property was settled. By whom or when the ownership of the property was settled is unknown at this time. But title to the property was granted to the Vestry of the Parish of St. James Goose Creek (Dr. Edward F. Parker 1987: personal communication).
Two missionaries served the parish between the time of Francis LeJau's death in 1717, and the arrival of Reverend Mr. Richard Ludlam in 1723. Ludlam served only five years, but made a lasting impression. "He proved a faithful and zealous worker, particularly interesting himself in converting and instructing the slaves...he bequeathed all of his estate, real and personal, to the society (SPG) in trust for erecting and maintaining a school for the instruction of the poor children of this parish" (Waring 1909:11). The Ludlam bequest was invested at interest because the vestry felt that the sum was too small to serve the hoped-for purpose. In the 1740s, more money was raised from the parishioners (by subscription) to be added to the Ludlam bequest. In 1756 the Reverend Mr. James Harrison reported that "the subscription for the schoolhouse had been raised, land bought, (the 300 acres mentioned above?) and bricks made" (Waring 1909:14). It is still unclear whether or not the school was actually built, because the will of Peter Taylor of Broom Hall plantation states in 1765 "I give unto the vestry and churchwardens of the parish of St. James Goose Creek one hundred pounds sterling money...to put the same to interest on good security until a school shall be erected on the land purchased for a school near the church..." (Waring 1909:16). Waring muddies the water further when he states "The school house of the parish was built of brick...and the foundation can still be traced. It was situated about a mile from the church and is supposed to have been erected about 1802, and was occupied for many years, but in consequence of the loss of funds by the vestry, they petitioned the legislature for permission to sell the tract of land; this was granted and in 1828 the land and building were sold. It was still standing in 1859, and then occupied as a dwelling" (Waring 1909:23). This passage may answer the question of where the missing 32 acres of church land went, but again no deed record was found, so we cannot say indubitably that this is true. It does not clarify whether or not a school was built in the 1750s, however. Heitzler states that the vestry "invested a number of endowments and subscriptions to provide education for the children of the parish" in the Colonial period (Heitzler 1983:162) but does not believe that a formal school building was erected at that time. It may well be the case that the school building of 1802 mentioned by Waring is the first to be built solely for that purpose, and that education during the Colonial period was conducted from the church or vestry building, or even from the parsonage. All of the above notwithstanding, the Ludlam fund supported schools in the parish throughout the nineteenth century and was still active as late as 1909 (Waring 1909:17-20).

The Goose Creek area was the early home of many of the province's most important citizens, but as the eighteenth century progressed, and the colony expanded its boundaries, the relative importance of the area diminished. Regular services at St. James Church were last held in 1808 (Waring 1909:17). In the eighteenth century, it was recognized that the plantations were an unhealthy place to spend the summers, and those that could afford to do so began to spend their summers in the city of Charleston (Wallace 1951:195), and after the Revolution, in small inland communities such as Summerville, Pineville, and Pinopolis (Heitzler 1983:81). Thus, early in the nineteenth century the country around Goose Creek was largely depopulated during the summers and services were held at the church only during the winter months (Thomas 1957:322). The structure was damaged by the earthquake of 1886 and again repaired (Waring 1909:323). Since that time services have been limited to a special annual service held the first Sunday after Easter (Thomas 1957:323).
RESEARCH DESIGN

Historic

The primary objectives of the archaeological reconnaissance survey of the Diocese properties were to locate and identify remains of historic structures that once existed as a complex of buildings associated with the St. James Church. Foremost among these structures should be remains of a brick parsonage and vestry building that were associated with the standing church, and the remains of a wooden church and associated parsonage that predates the present church/parsonage (Deas 1903; Waring 1909).

The goals and objectives of the survey were to record and describe the archaeological remains and assess their significance for possible inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places. That the St. James property is singularly religious in function offers unique opportunities to examine the social status of those persons whose duty it was to serve the church. If these structures could be located, test excavations might yield artifactual evidence showing obvious material differences between the parish priest and the wealthy planter whose spiritual needs they ministered.

It is recorded that the first rector of St. James Church, Dr. Francis LeJau, owned at least one slave (Letter from LeJau to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in 1711). Waring (1909:14) mentions at least one slave owned by the church, as does Dalcho (1820:259). It is reasonable to assume that these slaves occupied areas close to the church and buried their dead reasonably close by. If these areas could be located they might offer an opportunity to examine the role of slaves as servants of the church rather than those associated with plantation life. In addition, rice fields were leased out along Goose Creek, and a slave or slave family may have been in residence to attend the fields.

Another historic site that might possibly have existed within the survey area was a tavern. This tavern is on Mills Atlas of 1820, located on the east side of Goose Creek and just south of the road that crosses Goose Creek and continues to Charleston. This should place the remains of this structure approximately 200 meters north of the present-day St. James Church. Unfortunately, this also places the location in the vicinity of the present day road that has undergone modifications in recent decades that might have resulted in the total loss of these ruins. If ruins from a tavern that was operated so close to a prominent church could be found, they might offer an interesting social commentary about the local people of that time.

Prehistoric

Topsoils of the Coastal Plain are relatively shallow and most prehistoric archaeological sites located in this region are highly susceptible to disturbance from a number of sources. Bioturbation, caused by root action, insects, rodents, etc., are damaging even on level and relatively stable ground where no other forces are involved. Add to these factors the possibility of additional soil disturbance induced by logging, farming or other human activities, then chances of finding relatively undisturbed prehistoric archaeological sites with research potential are greatly limited.
The Coastal Plain of South Carolina, although relatively flat, nevertheless has distinct ecological environments. Minor fluctuations of ground elevation have created distinct biotic ecosystems. These systems are broadly categorized as uplands and wetlands and are most often divided by a narrow and biotically distinct ecosystem where the two join, normally characterized by bluffs or steeply sloping land forms separating the uplands and wetlands. Many species of plant and animals are found in these environments.

Native prehistoric populations, mobile and opportunistic, exploited each of these environments. Each environment perhaps offered certain seasonal advantages. For the hunter/gatherer, seasonal availability of mast and associated game perhaps dictated which environment they frequented at any given time. It would therefore seem practical to establish campsites in an area that made each environment mutually accessible, i.e., the ecotone that separates the upland and lowlands (Hanson et al. 1981).

The ecotones located between upland and lowland normally consist of sandy well-drained soils, as opposed to the frequently flooded and usually wet lowlands, which were unsuitable locations for long term human occupation. Hence, the well-drained bluffs and slopes dividing high- and lowlands, offered strategic locations for campsites (Michie 1980: 45-48, 73-74). Brockington argues that since the intrusion of pine into the uplands and high moisture tolerant trees into the lowlands about 5,000 years ago, the once pervasive domination of oak and hickory was forced into the limited areas between upland and wetland environments. He argues that this ecotone, as found in Berkeley County, is comparatively the richest in resources inviting human exploitation (Brockington 1980).

Prehistoric settlement patterns in the Coastal Plain of South Carolina have not been clearly defined but some ideas have been expanded. Where bluffs or elevated landforms occur and have highly permeable soils and are adjacent to wet lowlands, prehistoric occupation sites are likely to be found. These locations afford access to both upland and lowland environments for subsistence exploitation (Michie 1980: 73-74). The only landforms meeting this preferred landform status within the area of survey is the ecotone area that separates the high, flat pinelands from the low-lying wet area adjacent to Goose Creek. This relatively small ecotone area comprises approximately 25% of the total land within the survey area, or approximately 100 acres. This ecosystem, being well defined, offers an opportunity to further test this theory.

There is reason to believe this predictive settlement pattern may not be constant throughout prehistory in the Coastal Plain. Prehistoric Indian artifacts collected from the Coastal Plain intimate a greater number representative of the Archaic cultures' existence from interriverine zones. On the other hand, a greater number of artifacts representative of the Mississippian and Woodland cultures were collected from ecotone areas between uplands and lowlands (Charles 1979, 1981, 1983, 1985, 1986).

Survey methods were established that would test the postulate that prehistoric sites are more prevalent in upland ecotone areas and less prevalent in lowland zones with poorly drained soils. The higher pinelands, although not classified as wetlands, were nevertheless poorly drained and offered no opportunity to test the theory of possibly greater use of this area by Archaic cultures.
Methods

Methods of conducting an archaeological survey are dictated by a number of variables. The size of the area and the time for a survey are perhaps the greatest criteria in determining the methodology that must be employed to accomplish objectives. If there are predetermined objectives, or areas of special interest (such as the complex of structural ruins related to the St. James Church), then the survey objectives are clear and the survey should be conducted in a manner most likely to produce maximum return of archaeological data pertaining to those particular interests. Otherwise, if a tract of land is to be surveyed in its entirety to determine what cultural remains exist, or perhaps aid in planning for its future use or development, then other factors should be considered. The type of terrain to be surveyed plays an important part in planning a survey. Certain landforms such as well-drained elevated areas in close proximity to water have always been attractive places for human occupation. Even if no visible or archival evidence exists to instigate an investigation of these landforms, these areas have high probability of producing cultural remains, and should be given survey priority over most other landforms. Land that is cultivated or exposed by other actions such as erosion or logging, thus creating a highly visible surface, may reveal evidence of human activities simply by walking over its surface. Such exposed areas can be surveyed much more quickly than land that is heavily wooded or swampy. In swampy areas, test excavations must be conducted in order to determine if subsurface cultural remains are present. If a survey involves federal funds, then methodology differs from archaeological research designed to address a specific need of a landowner. Therefore it is important that a research design with certain objectives be outlined prior to initiating the survey.

According to the Diocese, it was desirable to accomplish 100% survey of St. James Church property. Locating and evaluating archaeological remains were given high priority. Topographic maps were studied and reviewed as well as other publications. SCIAA site files were also consulted. Thus, certain areas of the St. James property were slated as having high archaeological potential. Areas with high potential were visually assessed before subsurface testing.

To this end, the documents pointed out historic occupation on the northern end of the Diocese property near the church, and on the east side of County Road S-8-809, approximately 250-300 meters northeast of the church. The records effectively narrowed the area of probability for finding historic ruins associated with the St. James Church. The USGS Ladson Topographic Map (1958) revealed areas that were cleared and probably cultivated within church property boundaries.

Although extensive archaeological research has been conducted on both historic and prehistoric sites in Berkeley County (Anderson et al. 1982; Brooks and Scurry 1978; Brockington 1980; Asreen 1974; Canouts et al. 1982; Drucker and Anthony 1979; Green et al. n.d.; Herold et al. 1978), a search for records of previous archaeological investigations in the immediate area of St. James Church was fruitless except for the nomination of the property to National Register of Historic Places.

Fieldwork was scheduled for February 16, 1987 to be completed February 27, 1987. Considerable rain delayed starting the fieldwork until February 17. The completion date was changed to March 5. The field crew consisted of Joe Davis and Tommy Charles. Carl Steen of SCIAA worked for 2 1/2 days and volunteers Barbara Hiott and Linda Smith for 7 days. Upon arriving at the church property we conducted a reconnaissance of the entire property to familiarize ourselves with the area and develop procedures for investigation.
The property was subdivided into smaller units for survey control and to define site locations. These smaller areas were arbitrarily divided by roads and creeks and a large power line that transverses the property. Twelve subdivisions were designated within the property (Fig. 3).

Bishop Haynesworth gave first priority of the survey to a section of land located east of and bordering Red Bank Road (County Road S-8-37), just north of its junction with County Road S-8-208. Because the Diocese wished to develop this area as quickly as possible, the survey was begun here, and designated as tract 1.

A pedestrian visual survey of the entire church property was conducted to locate visible remains such as structural remnants, wells, and graves. Simultaneously, subsurface test units were excavated in feasible areas (i.e. areas not covered with standing water). Test excavations were placed along transects located in a random, non-aligned manner at distances of approximately 50 meters, measured by pacing, and were placed according to landform, soil moisture content, and the potential of an area to yield cultural material. Excavated soils were sifted through 1/4 inch wire mesh screen in an effort to recover artifacts for site analysis. Where the soils were too wet to sift, test unit soils were visually inspected and troweled in order to recover artifacts.

Subsurface test excavation units measured 50 x 50 cm and were excavated to a depth where sterile soil or subsoil was encountered. If no artifacts were recovered, excavations were discontinued at subsoil level. When cultural remains were located, additional test units were excavated in north, south, east and west directions away from the first discovery, and the distances between test units were reduced to 10 meters until no further cultural materials were recovered, after two successive test units were excavated in a given direction. Site dimensions were determined in this manner. Finding cultural materials outside the boundaries of the site is certainly a possibility, but this method is reasonably reliable for defining major artifact concentrations, and if further excavations are warranted, these areas would be recommended for excavation.

Upon completion of fieldwork an extensive search for archival data was accomplished in the following places: Berkeley County Courthouse, South Carolina Department of Archives and History; USC's Thomas Cooper Library, USC's Caroliniana Library, the South Carolina State Library, and the Episcopal Diocese of Charleston.
Figure 3: St. James Church survey tracts.
SURVEY AND DESCRIPTION OF TRACTS

In the following section, specific survey methods are described, along with conditions and discoveries within individual tracts. Evaluations and recommendations for each site are synthesized in a following section.

Tract 1

The land within tract 1 is uniformly flat and poorly drained with considerable amounts of shallow standing water. The southernmost portion of this tract is slightly lower than the northern portion and subjected to prolonged periods of inundation during times of excessive rainfall. This was the condition of the site during the survey.

Vegetation is predominantly pine forest with an estimated age of 30-50 years. The understory is thin and made up predominantly of wax myrtle; some sweetgum consistently grows in the wetter areas. Soils are sandy black humus over yellow sand, classified as Wahee and Meggett loams.

Wet, flat landforms such as these in tract 1 were infrequently occupied by people in prehistoric and historic times for reasons such as poor drainage, lack of a permanent water supply within a reasonable distance, etc. However, wells, as a water source, and ditches, for draining the area, could make it habitable. Therefore, the tract was inspected.

The USGS Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map of 1958 indicated that tract 1 was cleared at that time. It is likely that it was also cultivated, but no records confirmed this possibility, or who might have been responsible for this cultivation. In more recent times firebreaks have been plowed through the tract. These firebreaks were inspected for cultural remains where the soils were visible. Test excavation units were excavated throughout the entire tract, except for the extreme south end, where standing water of approximately 30 cm depth prevented excavation. Test units throughout most of this tract could not be sifted due to the wetness of the soil. Therefore, the excavated soils were troweled in an effort to recover artifacts, wherever possible. No cultural remains were observed above ground or recovered from subsurface test excavations within this tract.

Tract 2

Upon completion of surveying tract 1 as requested, areas with greater potential for yielding cultural remains were considered, leaving the wet, flat lands with apparent low potential until enough time was available to survey them. Tract 2 is bordered on the east by County Road S-8-809 and on the north by a large overhead power line that crosses the entire church property in an east-west direction. The western boundary is the marsh of Goose Creek, and the south boundary is a small unnamed branch that extends across the property in an east-to-west route.

Tract 2 is entirely covered by mature forest of predominantly very large pines that date to the turn of this century. The understory is a mixture of various hardwoods. The area is relatively clear of underbrush and visibility is good (Fig. 3). Soils are classified as Goldsboro loamy sand. Higher portions of this tract are well drained with dark gray-brown sandy humic loam 15-25 cm depth lying over yellow tan sand. This tract is fairly high and level throughout, gently sloping to Goose Creek swamp that lies to the west, dropping rather sharply to the small branch on the south, and to a small tributary of this branch that
forks toward the northeast through the southeast portion of the tract. The soils appear to be undisturbed, but this was difficult to determine from the small shovel tests.

A visual inspection of the tract's land surface revealed no above ground cultural remains. Following the visual survey, two parallel lines of test units were excavated along transects in an east-west direction. The first of these was approximately 7-10 meters south of the power line, and the second approximately 30 meters south of the power line. Both lines of excavations extended across the entire tract from County Road S-8-809 at the tract's east boundary to very near the western boundary of Goose Creek swamp, where soils became too wet to sift and excavations were discontinued. The test units along the two transects, in addition to the visual survey of the powerline clearing, covered the landform adequately.

Test excavations in this tract located an extensive prehistoric site (38BK956) that extends over most of the higher elevations. Portions of this site continue across the creek, which serves as the southern boundary, and into tracts 3 and 4. The portion of the site extending beyond the boundaries of tract 2 will be discussed in a following section.

Tract 3

Tract 3 is located at the southern boundary of the church property. It is bordered on the west by the Goose Creek marsh, on the east by County Road S-8-809, and on the north by a small unnamed branch that serves as the southern boundary of tracts 2 and 4. Perhaps as recently as 10-20 years ago the tract was planted in pine forest. Today, it is extremely dense with secondary growth of wax myrtle, honeysuckle, Carolina jasmine, briars, and other forms of plant life that normally establish themselves quickly after land is cleared; thus surveying the area was difficult.

Soils within this tract are classified as Bonneau loamy sands, which are nearly level with well drained soils. There is visual evidence of considerable mixing and disturbance of the soils and little if any distinct stratification remains. This disturbance, widespread over the entire tract, appears to have resulted from logging activities, and perhaps prior to that, cultivation. The Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map of 1958 shows that the area was cleared at that time. In recent years firebreaks have been plowed randomly over the area, further disturbing the soil.

No above ground cultural remains were observed in tract 3. Test units were excavated along four transect lines, extending across the entire tract in an east/west direction. Two of these were near the north and south boundaries and two were placed in the interior of the tract. When cultural materials were recovered, additional test units were excavated at right angles in north and south directions to confirm or disconfirm a concentration of artifacts. Prehistoric archaeological site 38BK956, discovered in tract 2, extends into and over much of the tract, but here the artifacts are sparse and widely scattered with no evidence of concentrations. The relatively few prehistoric cultural remains probably represent the outer limits of the site. Major soil disturbances have destroyed the potential archaeological research that might have existed within the tract.

Tract 4

Tract 4 is a small pie-shaped piece of land lying between the forks of the two small unnamed branches that form the southern boundary of tract 2 and the northern boundary of tract 3. It is bordered on the east by County Road S-8-809. A tract number was assigned
to it simply because it is distinctly separated from tracts 2 and 3 by the waters of the small creeks, creating a distinct area.

Tract 4 is visually and physiographically similar to tract 3. Soils are similar: well drained, very sandy, with little or no humic level remaining. Soils are classified as Bonneau loamy sand. There is visual evidence of considerable soil disturbance. As in tract 3, this disturbance was probably caused by logging and cultivation of the tract. The pine forest appears to be the same age as in tract 3 and was probably planted simultaneously. Underbrush is very dense, making survey difficult.

Tract 4 is relatively small and with the exception of a high and fairly level portion near the county road that extends west between the two creeks, it is not suitable for human occupation. After a thorough visual inspection, no above ground cultural remains were located. One line of test units was excavated on a transect extending from the county road on the east boundary, west along the center and highest portion of the tract, and another line near the creek on the tract's northwest border, the second line only because the adjacent tract, 2, had a prehistoric site located within its perimeters and there was a possibility it extended into tract 4.

No historic artifacts were recovered from test units. Prehistoric artifacts were sparse and widely scattered with no apparent concentrations. Prehistoric artifacts recovered are culturally similar to those in tracts 2 and 3, and as in tract 3, appear to represent the outer perimeter of prehistoric site 38BK956, which is primarily concentrated in tract 2. Consequently, the site boundaries were extended to include this tract as well as tract 3. The same site number, 38BK956, was designated for this area.

Tract 5

Tract 5 is bordered on the west by County Road S-8-809. A large power line that dissects the southern part of the church property serves as an arbitrary northern boundary. The eastern border is bounded by private property, which currently has a large trailer sales business, and adjacent to that, a trailer park. The southern boundary of the tract is also the southern boundary of the church property.

Tract 5 is primarily flat, wet pinelands with a considerable amount of underbrush in places, creating poor visibility and difficult survey. Other areas are open and afforded good visibility and survey conditions. Two very wet areas transverse the tract in an east-west direction. One is located approximately in the middle of the tract and the other close by the tract's southern boundary. Considerable water was standing in these areas during the survey. Soil types within this tract are somewhat variable. Most of the tract soil is classified as Meggett loam, found in the wetter areas, with a lesser amount of soils classified as Bonneau loamy sand, representative of the higher areas. Bonneau soils are limited to an area of perhaps several acres bordering County Road S-8-809 at its intersection with the previously mentioned power line serving as the tract's northern boundary. This area of Bonneau soil is elevated above and is better drained than the rest of the tract. Soils from test excavations within the area classified as Bonneau were the only ones within the tract dry enough to be sifted through the 1/4 inch wire mesh to recover potential artifacts. Soils in all other areas were too wet and thus were troweled to determine if artifacts were present.

Survey transects ran in a west/east direction beginning at the tract's western boundary, County Road S-8-809, continuing to the tract's eastern boundary. Transects were spaced approximately 50 meters apart in a north/south direction. A visual survey of the land was conducted simultaneously while excavating subsurface test units. The only
above ground cultural material observed was recent garbage strewn along the county road on the west border and along the tract's eastern edge behind the trailer park.

Subsurface testing located remains of an early 20th century house in the relatively high and well drained area of Bonneau soils adjacent to County Road S-8-809. Remains of this structure lie approximately 100 meters south of the power line and approximately 20 meters east of County Road S-8-809. This particular area is one of burned-over pineland with a dense understory of wax myrtle and briars. Additional test units were excavated in north, south, east, and west directions to determine site dimensions and to recover artifacts for analysis. Test units were excavated to a depth where cultural materials were no longer recovered. This termination of artifacts occurred at depths ranging from 30 cm to 50 cm below ground surface. No footing or other definite house boundaries were located, but the dense concentrations of cultural material indicate a site of approximately 30 x 30 meters. A brick well was found approximately 20 meters southeast of the house site and in direct association with the house site. The above ground wall has collapsed but a portion below ground is highly visible. It is constructed in an odd manner. The walls are square instead of round (Fig. 4). Otherwise the brick and masonry used in its construction seem appropriate for association with an early 20th century house. This house is shown on the USGS Ladson SC Quadrangle Topographic Map, 1919, but the 1958 version of this map does not show this structure. The site was recorded as 38BK959 and is described in the historic archaeological sites section of this report.

Figure 4: The square well at the 20th century house site, 38BK959.
Tract 6

Tract 6 is located south of St. James Church between Goose Creek marsh, which borders the western side, and County Road S-8-809, which forms the eastern boundary. The power line serves as the southern boundary, separating it from tract 2, and the northern boundary is a small low-lying wet area that runs in an east-west direction across the church property, approximately halfway between the power line and St. James Church.

The land within tract 6 is somewhat variable. It lies within the ecotone between the low-lying swamps of Goose Creek and the flat, higher elevated pine flats that make up much of the landscape east of County Road S-8-809. Much of it is high and relatively well drained, especially near the eastern border. Westward, near Goose Creek, the land slopes toward the creek, the soils become much wetter and vegetation changes from predominantly pine forest to types more tolerant of water, these moisture-tolerant types being typically mixed hardwoods. Some areas are open and park-like, others are extremely dense and difficult to survey. The entire tract shows evidence of past cultivation and logging, activities that caused considerable soil disturbance. The portions of land that slope toward Goose Creek exhibit visible traces of erosion in the form of numerous shallow gullies or washes that run downhill. The soils of the higher elevations are classified as Bonneau loamy sand, and those of the lower, wet areas as Meggett loam.

Test excavations were conducted along transects spaced approximately 50 meters apart, and in a north/south direction. Distance between test units was also approximately 50 meters. Each test unit was screened through 1/4 inch wire mesh where possible, which was most of the higher elevations. The lower lands were saturated with water and screening was not possible. Here, excavated soils were troweled to determine if artifacts were present.

This tract, like much of the church property, has experienced considerable use as a garbage dumping area by local populations in recent years, the earliest debris observed being no earlier than the twentieth century. Other than this recent debris, cultural material was sparse and thinly scattered. The small quantity of historical cultural material recovered from test excavations appear to be a result of this recent garbage disposal and not from human occupation of the area.

Tract 7

Tract 7 lies within the ecotone between Goose Creek Swamp and the high pine flats to the east. Tract 7 shares a common boundary with tract 6, its southern boundary being the northern boundary of tract 6. The east boundary is County Road S-8-809, and the northern boundary is a small unnamed creek that flows through the property in an east to west direction several hundred meters north of St. James Church.

Soils within tract 7 are classified as Bonneau loamy sand, Lucy loamy sand, and Meggett loam. Most of the land within the tract is well drained with the exception of the lower slopes and bottom land adjacent to Goose Creek and the small creek that serves as the tract's northern boundary. The topography here is more diverse than in any other of the designated tracts and reflects a great deal of human activity and use of the land. Erosion on the westward slopes is considerable, as well as just south of St. James Church, where it is visually evident almost to County Road S-8-809.
Vegetation over the tract is highly variable. The lower elevations near the swamp and creeks are predominantly mixed hardwoods, but there are also scattered large pines within these hardwood communities. The uplands have stands of large pine mixed with live oak and other hardwoods. Magnolia are scattered over the uplands and lowlands as well. Near the southern boundary there is considerable young pine that indicates the area was cleared and perhaps cultivated in the not-to-distant past. The USGS Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map of 1958 shows that this area was cleared at that time. Naturalized domestic plants such as wisteria, gardenia, silverberry, privet hedge, jonquill, and periwinkle are common in the tract's higher elevations and serve as a good indicator of possible historic occupation of those particular areas, or use as gardens or burial sites.

Near the tract's southern boundary on the high, level portion midway between Goose Creek and County Road S-8-809, is a natural depression or shallow pond that is out of character for this environment. It is roughly circular in form and has an estimated diameter of 50 meters. Its depth is undetermined. Vegetation surrounding this pond is not characteristic of that normally seen in consistently wet environments. The pond is surrounded with pines and hardwoods typical of upland, well-drained soils. The pond is surrounded by flat, sandy land on the north, east, and south, but on the west side there is a slightly higher sandy ridge running in a north-south direction that effectively blocks natural drainage of this pond toward the lower lands that lie in that direction. Through this sand ridge, a ditch has been excavated for the purpose of draining the pond. This ditch shows evidence of having been excavated many years ago as it now has large trees growing along its banks. Perhaps the ditch kept the area dry enough to allow the present vegetation to establish dominance. Currently the ditch is undergoing the natural process of filling due to erosion and plant action. It seems a matter of time until this wet area, if left undisturbed, will once again revert to its more natural state. This drainage ditch is probably associated with farming activities that likely took place here in bygone years. This wet area would seem to indicate some sort of subsoil anomaly, distinct from the surrounding area, as no other such depressions in this particular ecotone holds water. There is no evidence of other ditches to indicate that other such highland ponds might have existed.

Survey in tract 7 was conducted slightly differently than in other tracts. Whereas in most tracts visual survey was done simultaneously with subsurface testing, here we first conducted a visual inspection of the entire tract prior to subsurface testing. Archival research revealed that this area would most likely contain remains of historic structures other than those previously recorded (St. James Church, 38BK59, and 38BK889, the Parsonage Site). Certain areas were extremely overgrown with wisteria vines, privet hedge and other naturalized domestic vegetation that gave credibility to such a possibility. These areas of obvious potential were closely examined, by visual inspection and test excavations. The findings and sites recorded in these areas are discussed in a following section.

St. James Church is the obvious centerpiece of the Diocese property, but ruins of other structures exist nearby, that if properly managed, might enhance interpreting the church's illustrious history. Ruins of two such structures were located a short distance northwest of the church. The most recent one, torn down in 1961, represents the dwelling place of the parents of Mr. E. G. Simmons, the present-day caretaker of the church (Mrs. E. G. Simmons, Personal Communication). One reference indicated it was the home site of the church sexton (A Charleston Sketchbook 1796-1806, by Charles Fraser, text by Alice R. Huger Smith, copyright 1959). The most recent structure was small, with approximate dimensions of 8 x 9 meters and constructed of modern materials. All that remains of this structure are the partially exposed brick footing and the steps, which are intact (Fig. 5). A short distance to the northwest of these ruins is a standing brick well. The well is uncommonly small in diameter, measuring only 67 cm across, constructed of modern
materials. This well was probably associated with the more recent dwelling. Other modern cultural materials scattered around the immediate area were household items of glass, plastic, linoleum floor covering, wire nails, etc. Immediately north and west of this area are large quantities of discarded modern day household items such as stoves, refrigerators, etc., and the remains of an automobile from the 1950s. (Figs. 6 and 7).

The possibility of an earlier structure at this spot is substantiated by the recovery of brick, tabby mortar, and other artifactual remains predating those thought to be associated with the Simmons house. These artifacts were recovered from within the more recent structure. It is quite likely these earlier artifacts were associated with the church vestry building mentioned in records and shown in a painting of the church by Charles Fraser in a Charleston Sketchbook, 1796-1806, (page 17, copyright 1959) (Fig. 8). Until further archaeological research is conducted to separate and establish a composite of each structure, the area has been assigned a single archaeological site number, 38BK960.

Between these ruins and the present-day Vestry Building, which lies approximately 50 meters to the east, and just north of St. James Church, was an old road that led to the church. This road ran in a northerly direction parallel to present-day County Road S-8-809. It is extremely overgrown in places but still visible. The road's present dimensions are approximately 7 meters wide; the depth varies in places but it averages perhaps 1 meter deeper than the adjacent ground. Whether this was caused by an attempt to grade the road, or erosion, could not be determined. This road was recorded as archaeological site 38BK962.

Perhaps the most intriguing sites discovered in tract 7 are an old cemetery and a nearby dwelling area. The cemetery is located approximately 65 meters south of St. James Church and just west of County Road S-8-809. The area is extremely overgrown with wisteria, privet hedge, and other domestic plants, making the ground surface difficult to inspect even in February when foliage is comparatively absent. Had the survey been conducted in summer it is not likely the cemetery would have been found (Fig. 9). That this area was a possible burial site first became evident when several slight depressions were discovered, uniform in size, spaced in an orderly manner. Further investigation of the overgrown area revealed 16 of these depressions. Three of these 16 had stone grave markers. Two of the markers had no inscriptions, one was inscribed with the following: C. Leftenant, December 24, 18(?)9 (date damaged) July 22, 1916 (Fig. 10). There would seem to be a reasonable possibility of locating other burials in this vicinity. Other depressions less uniform in size and appearance that may or may not be burials were found scattered over the immediate area in a random manner. Excavations would be necessary to determine their true nature. Archaeological site number 38BK957 was assigned this cemetery.

Immediately north of this burial area is a low, wet area that shows evidence of considerable erosion. Because areas of this type are not suitable for burials or dwellings, this low area was established as a natural boundary to the northward expansion of the cemetery. The land to the west and southwest is high and very well drained and thus quite possibly the cemetery extends in that direction. Additional burials were not identified in that direction, but the possibility for their occurrence still exists. Subsurface tests recovered artifacts indicating a probable historic dwelling site, perhaps contemporary with the nearby burials. A moderate number of early eighteenth century artifacts such as black glass, hand wrought nails, lead glazed slipware, and numerous small sherds of colonoware were recovered from an area measuring 80 meters in a north/south direction, and 176 meters in an east/west direction. These early eighteenth century artifacts, coupled with the absence of brick structural remains, are good indications of a low status dwelling area. It could conceivably represent the homesite(s) of slaves belonging to the church or its rectors.
Figure 5: Brick house foundation, site 38BK960.

Figure 6: Household items at site 38BK960.
Figure 7: 1950s automobile, west of site 38BK960.

Figure 8: Charles Fraser's painting of the St. James Church.
Figure 9: Historic cemetery, site 38BK957.

Figure 10: Dense feral vegetation in the area of the historic cemetery, 38BK957.
These remains could also be in direct association with site 38BK957, an earlier nearby burial ground.

These small, eroded pottery sherds, probably from the same pot, revealed evidence of Indian occupation, perhaps a small group who briefly used the area.

Tract 8

Tract 8 is triangular in shape, located between County Road S-8-809 on the west and County Road S-8-208 on the east. County Road S-8-208 branches off from County Road S-8-809 just south of St. James Church and continues in a southeasterly direction, forming a triangular shaped tract of land as the distance between these two roads increases. This tract continues south for an approximate distance of 1/3 mile; there, a large power line crosses the property and thus serves as the tract's south boundary.

Geographically, tract 8 is much like tracts 1 and 2, that is, flat and very wet. Most of the tract is uniform in flatness but there is some variability of topography near the tract's south end. Near County Road S-8-208 there is an area slightly lower, and subsequently wetter, than average for the tract. Continuing south across this low area, the land rises to its highest point beneath the power line. This elevated area continues west to County Road S-8-809.

Vegetation in this tract is predominantly pine with shrub undergrowth consisting mainly of wax myrtle and briars. The wetter areas near the south boundary has some wetland hardwoods growing there. The higher area just south and west of this wet area is extremely dense with wax myrtle. Fires have contributed to considerable falling of trees and subsequent secondary growth, making the area difficult to survey.

Test excavations were along transect lines paralleling the two county roads, and in an east/west direction paralleling the power line at the tract's south boundary. Then the tract's interior was surveyed in the same manner. Visual inspection for above ground structures was done simultaneously with subsurface testing. Much of the tract was covered with standing water during the survey or was very wet. All excavated soils, therefore, were troweled through in an effort to recover cultural materials. Soil types are Bonneau loamy sand, Duplin fine sandy loam and Ocilla loam fine sand.

No above ground or subsurface cultural remains were found in tract 8.

Tract 9

Tract 9 is located between County Road S-8-208 on the west and County Road S-8-37 (Red Bank Road) on the east. The south boundary is formed where these two roads intersect. The north boundary is a small dirt road that crosses the tract from near the rear of the present-day St. Mary's Episcopal Mission Building and extends west to a point near the intersection of County Road S-8-208 and S-8-809. This small dirt road that serves as the tract's northern boundary appears to have been formed simply by people driving through the area to dispose of garbage, which is strewn along both sides of it. It was designated "Garbage Road" simply for reference as a survey boundary marker.
Tract 9 is geographically similar to tracts 1, 5, and 8. The tract's east side, near County Road S-8-37, was the wettest area encountered during the survey. Water was over our knees in places and it was impossible to do more than a visual inspection of that portion of the property (Fig. 11). The west and north portions had little standing water but soils were still saturated with water and too wet to sift through the screen. In these areas the excavated soils were troweled to determine if cultural materials were present. Soils are classified as Duplin fine sandy loam and Bonneau loamy sand.

Vegetation is also similar to that in tracts 1, 5 and 8: predominantly pine with an understory of wax myrtle and briars. The secondary growth in this tract is particularly dense; the area has been burned, and much of the smaller vegetation such as wax myrtle has fallen over, making passage difficult in places. It appears ice or high wind might have been a secondary cause of this collapse of vegetation.

No cultural remains were found in tract 9 with the exception of recent garbage that has been dumped along the tract's northern boundary.

Tract 10

Tract 10 is located at the north end of the St. James Church property. It is bordered by Goose Creek on the west and County Road S-8-809 on the east. These two landmarks intersect just south of Old State Road, forming the tract's northern boundary. The south boundary is a small creek that traverses the property in an east/west direction just north of St. James Church (tract 7's north boundary). Geographically, the tract is similar to tracts 6 and 7. Tract 10, however, is somewhat lower in elevation and subsequently did not drain as well as the other similar tracts in spite of having relatively sandy soils. The soil was too wet to sift through the screens in most places. In these wet areas excavated soils were troweled through in an effort to recover potential cultural remains. Soils are classified as Lucy loamy sand and Craven loam.

Vegetative ground cover is extremely dense and consists primarily of privet hedge and wax myrtle. Visibility within this undergrowth is limited to perhaps 5-10 meters in places. Large pines, as well as some hardwoods, cover the tract. This tract shows no signs of having been cut, although it is likely it was cleared sometime in the past.

According to Mills 1820 Atlas a tavern existed at that time near the extreme northern end of this tract. Most likely, it was located just outside the boundary. There has been considerable change in the area's roads in recent years due to widening and possibly altering the original routes, a process that is continuing even today with the widening of County Road S-8-809 currently in process.

Transect lines were excavated in a north/south direction, and visual survey was accomplished simultaneously, although due to the thick undergrowth, areas of poor visibility were examined more closely than would have otherwise been necessary. Visual survey of the area was non-productive with the exception of verifying that the old Colonial Road continued through this tract until it intersected with present day County Road S-8-809 near its merge with Old State Road. Subsurface testing was more rewarding, recovering eighteenth and nineteenth century artifacts and also some clear glass and rusted nails of undetermined age. These artifacts were recovered near County Road S-8-809. They do not appear to represent a major concentration or to be associated with any structural remains. They appear to be from a disturbed context, but this is uncertain based on the small test
units excavated. We could not determine if these artifacts were in association with the tavern. The entire area has been occupied for so many years that it is difficult to determine if these isolated finds are representative of a dwelling or simply someone's garbage. Until further archaeological investigations, the origin of these artifacts and their significance cannot be determined, thus no individual site number was assigned. They will be discussed with the Colonial Road site, 38BK962.

Tract II

Tract II is located directly east of tract 10; the tracts are separated by County Road S-8-809, which serves as tract II's western boundary. The same small branch that serves as a southern boundary for tract 10 also serves as the southern boundary for tract II. The north and east boundary is formed by a single property line that was surveyed across the property, apparently in recent years, as it still has survey flagging tape marking its route. This survey line begins at the tract's northwest corner and continues in a southeasterly direction until it intersects with the small branch that serves as the southern boundary, thus forming a small tract, roughly triangular in shape.

Geographically, tract II is rough and uneven, showing signs of considerable ground disturbance from cultural activities. Along the property line that runs northwest/southeast is a depression that resembles an old roadbed. But it could also represent excavations for a past tramway, common in this area for removing logs from the swamps. Perhaps the soil was removed for fill dirt. Erosion seems a remote possibility unless the area was first highly disturbed by some other activity. The area is very wet and has standing water in some places. Most of the tract was too wet to sift soils from test excavations and they had to be troweled to determine if cultural remains were present. Soils are classified as Duplin fine sandy loam.

Vegetation within this tract is predominantly mature forest composed of mixed hardwoods and some large pines. There is a minimum of undergrowth.

Test excavations were excavated along transect lines in an east/west direction and the entire area was thoroughly inspected visually. The only cultural remains located were a small concentration of burned coal, or cinders, just under the leaf mold at ground surface. These cinders could represent a number of activities. They could have been used to heat a nearby house, a number of which still exist near the church property; they could represent some type of activity that required a steam engine, such as an early sawmill. If the previously mentioned depression was a tramway, then we might expect to find cinders along its route, although this seems improbable since most of them used readily available and cheaper wood. No determination was made concerning the origin or use of these cinders. No sites were recorded in this tract.
Tract 12

Tract 12 is located immediately south of tract 11. The small branch that serves as the southern boundary for tract 11 also serves as the northern boundary for tract 12. The tract lies east of County Road S-8-809, which forms its western boundary. The southern boundary is a small dirt road that separates tracts 12 and 9. The east boundary is the same survey line previously mentioned as the north/east boundary of tract 11. This line turns in a more southerly direction where it intersects with the small creek serving as the northern boundary of tract 12, and roughly parallels Red Bank Road until it reaches the small dirt road that serves as the tract's southern boundary. At that point the line turns east and intersects with County Road S-8-37 (Red Bank Road).

Vegetation in tract 12 is predominantly pine, much of which is young, particularly in the east side of the tract where there are signs of plow furrows. There are large mature pines scattered over parts of the tract's western portions in areas not showing visible signs of cultivation. There are some scattered hardwoods, particularly in the north and west portions of the tract. The south end of the tract is extremely dense with wax myrtle and briars and has suffered considerable fire damage in years past. Fire apparently weakened much of the small timber and scrub allowing either ice or high winds to lay them over, making passage through the south portion of the tract difficult. The north end appears to have escaped this fate, it is more open and was much easier to survey. The north end of the tract, near the branch that forms the tract boundary, has considerable growth of domestic plants such as privet hedge and wisteria. This is the area of previously recorded archaeological site 38BK889, thought to be the second church parsonage.

Soils are classified as Duplin fine sandy loam and Meggett loam. Degree of soil moisture varies throughout the tract. Some soils from test excavations could be sifted through screen but most could not. Oddly, the wettest area within the tract was the area of highest elevation in the vicinity of the supposed parsonage, an area that visually appeared to be well drained. In that area, ground water quickly filled test excavations. This appears to be a result of cultivation and subsequent erosion of sandy soils from the hilltop to a lower level, leaving a compact clayey soil that holds water.

Subsurface test excavations were conducted along east/west transects over the entire tract. Good visibility in all areas except for the supposed parsonage allowed for simultaneous visual inspection for above ground structural remains.

Archaeologically, tract 12 has considerable promise. In addition to the structural remains of the parsonage, the remains of an early 20th century house were discovered just east of these ruins. The location is so close that no separate site number was assigned. It was included as part of site 38BK889 until additional archaeological excavations establish site limits and cultural affiliation. Another historic site discovered was an earthen dam located east of County Road S-8-809 (Fig.12). It may have served as a dam for a rice reserve, or a garden pond. It could also have served as a bridge across the creek and adjacent low area. This dam lies on a direct line between the supposed parsonage and St. James Church and would be the logical location for a road. The dam was assigned site number 38BK995.
Figure 11: Typical wet pine flats on the St. James Church property.

Figure 12: Historic dam, site 38BK955.
One prehistoric site was recorded in tract 12. This site is located along both sides of the small creek just behind or east of this earthen dam. A scatter of prehistoric artifacts consisting primarily of pottery sherds begins just east of the dam and continues in that direction for a short distance. Soils within this site appear to be highly disturbed and were probably transported to their present location by erosional process from the surrounding higher grounds. Each of these sites will be discussed in a later section.
SITE DESCRIPTIONS, DATA, AND EVALUATIONS

Terminology For Describing Prehistoric Stone Artifacts and Raw Materials Used in their Manufacture

Lithics: Any of the numerous stone materials used in the manufacture of tools.

Biface: The term biface means the artifact has been manufactured by the removal of flakes from both sides of a piece of stone as opposed to removal of flakes from only one side. Tools manufactured by this method generally have a symmetrical, well finished appearance and are typical of those most commonly referred to as "arrow heads, spear heads or knives."

Uniface: Stone tools manufactured by the removal of flakes from only one side of the intended tool. This method leaves the finished product with the ventricle, or bottom side, relatively flat and the dorsal, or top side, somewhat rounded, creating an acute edge where the ventricle and dorsal meet. This creates a very strong edge, less prone to shatter in use than the more obtuse biface edge. It is the method most often used to manufacture a form of tool appropriately called "scrapers," as their primary function was for the scraping of wood, bone, hides, etc.

Dorsal: The "back" or top of the flake or artifact.

Ventral: The bottom of the flake or artifact.

Lateral: The side or edge of a flake or artifact.
Primary Flake: The first flakes removed when making stone tools. These are usually larger than those that follow and often the dorsal surface will be completely covered by the rind (cortex, or natural surface of the stone).

Secondary Flake: Usually, but not necessarily, smaller than the preceding primary flakes. Dorsal surface may have some cortex remaining but also shows previous flake removals.

Tertiary Flake: Thinning or finishing flakes, smaller than preceding primary and secondary flakes and lacking cortex.

Argillite: A stone commonly used in the manufacture of stone tools by prehistoric people in the Piedmont (e.g., Taylor and Smith 1978; Goodyear, House, and Ackerly 1979; Cable and Cantley 1979; Charles 1981). It is far less common in the Coastal Plain (e.g., Anderson, Lee, and Parler 1979; Trinkley 1980a; Charles 1981). Originating as a (metamorphosed) sedimentary material (e.g., Novick 1978:431), it is classified as laminated claystone, hematite along bedding planes, and some biotite. It is generally inferior for the manufacture of tools, often being so soft that it can easily be flaked or broken with the fingernail or hand, but the quality is variable, and occasionally some of excellent quality for the manufacture of tools is found.

Coastal Plain Chert: A rock resembling flint and consisting essentially of cryptocrystalline quartz or fibrous chalcedony. In South Carolina, the major source of these cherts are outcrops associated with the Flint River Geological Formation in Allendale County, South Carolina, but it cannot be said with certainty that more local, but probably less significant, sources of similar cherts do not exist. It is perhaps the highest quality readily available chert in the Coastal Plain.

Black Mingo, or Manchester Chert: Black Mingo, or "Manchester," chert is also a Coastal Plain chert, but differences between Black Mingo cherts and those from the Flint River Formation are visually apparent. Black Mingo cherts are more fossiliferous in appearance with marine shell fragments and fossils visible in a matrix of chalcedony. These shell/fossil inclusions usually make up a considerable portion of the stone's total mass and often is so dominant that the stone is no more than a mass of coquina shell cemented together and is useless for the purpose of manufacturing stone tools. It is only when the chalcedony is abundant enough that the stone can be worked into tools. Rarely, it is almost pure chalcedony and in this state perhaps is equal to the finest of stone materials available with which to manufacture tools.

Outcrops of Black Mingo or "Manchester" cherts are known to occur in Sumter County, South Carolina in the vicinity of Manchester State Park, hence the name "Manchester." They are associated with the Thanetian Black Mingo Geological Formation. Only two prehistoric quarries have been recorded, 38SU42, in Sumter County, and
38CLI7, in Clarendon County, but it is likely others exist, perhaps now covered by the waters of lakes Marion and Moultrie.

Quartz: A mineral SiO₂, consisting of a silicon dioxide that occurs in colorless and transparent or colored hexagonal crystals and also in crystalline masses, common throughout the Piedmont regions of the Southeast and in Coastal Plain rivers in cobble form.

Quartzite: A compact granular rock composed of quartz and derived from sandstone by metamorphism. Nearest source uncertain. Probably brought into the Coastal Plain by rivers originating in the mountains or Piedmont.

Orthoquartzite: Variously described as sandstone (Brockington 1980), quartzite (Anderson, Lee, and Parler 1979), or orthoquartzite (House and Wogaman 1978). Thin section analysis of an artifact recovered from a site near the Fall Line indicated that the material was a chalcedonic cemented quartz arenite (Anderson 1979a:35), probably from either the Upper Cretaceous Black Creek Formation or the Paleocene/Eocene Black Mingo Formation, both of which outcrop in the Coastal Plain.

Siltstone: A rock composed chiefly of indurated (hardened) silt, naturally found within a few miles of the present coastline, usually in rivers or low areas.

Prehistoric Sites

38BK956

Site 38BK956 is located in the southwestern corner of the church property. This is an extensive site that covers several acres, overlapping the boundaries of three different designated tracts (Tracts 2, 3, and 4, see Fig. 3).

Site dimensions are 300 x 300 meters. The site's northern boundary is the overhead power line designated as a survey boundary marker for the purpose of this investigation. The southern boundary is very near the church property line; the eastern boundary is County Road S-8-809 (Foster Creek Road) and the western boundary is Goose Creek Swamp.

The site was discovered during subsurface testing of the sandy terraces that gently slope westward toward Goose Creek in tract 2. Subsequent testing of adjacent tracts 3 and 4 confirmed the extension of this site into those two tracts as well. These terraces are bisected by two small unnamed streams which merge into a single stream, flowing westward to Goose Creek.
Mature pine forest covers the slope and top of the sandy terrace in tract 2. Subsurface testing in this area of the site yielded artifacts from what appears to be a relatively undisturbed context. This assumption, however, is based on the visual appearance of the land lacking obvious disturbances, and the occurrence of fairly distinct layers of soils observed in small test excavations (50 cm x 50 cm). These small shovel excavations, while a reasonably good method of locating cultural remains, are not absolutely definitive for determining soil integrity. Larger test excavations to expose and examine soil profiles would be needed to access accurately the site's integrity. Most of the artifacts recovered came from the interface of a dark grey-brown sandy humic loam representing surface soils, and a yellow-tan sand lying beneath. The upper sandy humic soil zone varied between 15 and 25 centimeters in depth. The yellow-tan sand continued to an undetermined depth. These soils are classified as Goldsboro loamy sand.

The areas of site 38BK956 tested in tracts 3 and 4 produced artifacts scattered thinly over both tracts, progressively diminishing in density as distance from tract 2 became greater. Soils in each of these tracts show visible signs of disturbance in recent years. Both tracts have been planted in pine forest, perhaps no more than two to three decades ago. Recent firebreaks transverse the area. The Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map 1958 shows the area cleared and it is reasonable to expect it was cultivated at or prior to that time. Test excavations indicate little, if any, distinct stratigraphy of soils. It cannot be said with certainty there are no undisturbed areas remaining. It is possible that below the obvious surface disturbances there might remain undisturbed cultural deposits. Larger excavation units to examine soil profiles would be needed to determine this. Soils in these two tracts are classified as Bonneau loamy sand.

Artifacts recovered from site 38BK956 consist of small pottery sherds and lithic debitage. Identifiable pottery types are Thoms Creek punctate, Deptford check stamp, and Cape Fear series cord impressed. These ceramics are sand tempered wares of the Early to Late Woodland periods (South 1976: 14-55) (See Table 1; Fig. 13).

Lithic debitage recovered consists predominantly of small tertiary flakes, the single exception being an unbroken biface (knife/projectile point) of the Early Woodland period. This single biface is a rather crude example and is made from orthoquartzite.

Analysis of artifacts recovered from test excavations indicate sporadic occupation of this site for at least two thousand years beginning with the Early Woodland and extending through the Middle Woodland periods. This apparent sporadic use of a site that appears ideal for occupation probably reflects no more than the limited testing done. More extensive excavations should recover cultural materials indicating a much longer occupation of this site.
Figure 13a: Siltstone chunk, Coastal Plain chert tertiary flake, Quartz primary flake, Cape Fear Series cord marked sherd, Deptford check stamped sherd, orthoquartzite stemmed hafted biface.

Figure 13b: Thoms Creek linear punctate sherd, Deptford check stamped sherd, Stallings Island fiber tempered sherd w/mending hole, Coastal Plain chert tertiary flake, Rhyolite tertiary flake.
Isolated historic artifacts recovered from 38BK956 represent limited use of these sandy terraces during historic times, probably as cultivated fields. These items represent a nineteenth to twentieth century occupation (see Table 1).

38BK958

Site 38BK958 is a prehistoric site located within designated tract 12. It lies east of County Road S-8-809. The site begins at a historic dam (38BK955) and continues east, straddling the unnamed stream, previously dammed, which flows in a westerly direction to merge with another nameless stream (northern boundary of tract 12) (Fig. 3). The dimensions of this site are 61 meters north/south and 61 meters east/west.

This portion of tract 12 is covered with a mature forest of mixed pine and hardwoods. There was no visible evidence of ground disturbance other than the earthen dam (38BK955). This lack of visual disturbance is deceiving. The dam itself has mature trees growing from it, and if it were not obviously a man-made work, it too would show no visible signs of soil disturbance. The surrounding area could well have suffered considerable disturbance that has since been obliterated. Subsequent test excavations indicated this to be the case.

Subsurface tests indicated a brown sandy well-drained humic soil over yellow-tan sand. These soils vary in depth to 30 cm below ground surface, becoming thinner upslope. Underlying these well drained sandy soils are wetter, more clayey soils, classified as Meggett loam. They are not very suitable for human occupation. The overlying sandy soils are not characteristic of this lowlying terrain. Surface soils observed at site 38BK958 are similar to those on adjacent hilltops. This type of soil is not found in this locality and was transported to this area probably by forces of erosion. Cultivation has taken place on the adjacent hilltops and slopes, as evidenced by the plow furrows. This sandy soil is almost absent from much of the hilltop, further suggesting that the soils of site 38BK958 are not in situ but were transported downhill by erosion, enhanced by the clearing of trees and subsequent cultivation. Artifacts from this site were all recovered from the top 30 centimeters of soils. They were fragmented, worn, and situated in no consistent level, indicating the artifacts within this site were transported as the soil by the same erosional process.

Artifacts recovered from site 38BK958 consisted of several small worn pottery sherds and two small tertiary flakes. Identifiable pottery types are Stalling fiber tempered, a ware representative of the earliest known pottery occurring in the Southeastern United States, and, later, sand tempered wares of the Thoms Creek punctate, Deptford check stamp, and Cape Fear series cord impressed types. These artifacts indicate a sporadic occupation of approximately 2,500 to 3,000 years ago, dating from the Late Archaic to the Late Woodland (see Table 2). The lithic flakes were not culturally diagnostic (Fig. 14).

Site 38BK958 appears to represent no more than a water transported collection of prehistoric artifacts, representative not of their present location, but of an adjacent hilltop site that suffered severe erosion.
Historic Sites

38BK955--Historic Dam

Site 38BK955 is an earthen dam located east of County Road S-8-809, situated at a 45° angle to the road. The south end of the dam, or the end nearest the road, is obliterated a short distance before it reaches the vertex with the angle of the road. This damage probably resulted from road modifications in recent years. The dam extends in a northerly direction from near the road for a distance of 38 meters at which point it intersects with higher ground that forms the north bank of the pond. St. James Church (38BK59) lies approximately 125-150 meters in a southwesterly direction from the dam; approximately the same distance in a northeasterly direction is the "Parsonage" site (38BK89; see Fig. 14).

This earthen dam is 38 meters long, 9 meters wide at the base, and 3 meters wide at the top. An unnamed stream flowing from the east toward Goose Creek, and previously providing water for this pond, has now breached the site; the dam is 1.8 meters high measured from the bottom of this creek (see Fig. 15).

Tract 12, in which site 38BK955 is located, is covered in mature forest with sparse to moderate understory growth. Shovel tests revealed a humic soil over a dark, gumlike wet loam. These soils are classified as Meggett loam, which is level-to-depressional and poorly drained.

No archival data on this dam have been found, but it could have been used as a reservoir for rice cultivation, or a garden pond. It could have served as a bridge across the drainage area between the Parsonage and St. James Church (Fig. 14). It is highly unlikely that 38BK955 functioned as a mill dam.

38BK957--Historic Cemetery

This site was discovered during a visual inspection of tract 7 prior to subsurface testing. Site 38BK957, an historic cemetery, is located immediately west of County Road S-8-809 (Foster Creek Road) and near its junction with County Road S-8-208. The site is 62 meters south of the St. James Church (see Fig. 3). Site dimensions are 50 meters from north to south along Foster Creek Road and 70 meters east to west measured from this road. This arbitrary boundary encompassed all obvious graves and depressions assumed to be graves; it does not preclude the possibility of other graves in the vicinity and outside of the boundaries. No subsurface testing was necessary to substantiate that this site was a historic cemetery. To define cemetery boundaries would require time and testing beyond the scope of this survey. Limited shovel tests such as those utilized during the survey could not define the cemetery's boundaries and would only detract from the site's integrity. Thus, no subsurface testing was accomplished in this area, leaving the site intact as possible.

Site 38BK957 is situated in an area heavily overgrown with wisteria vines, privet hedge, and other feral domestic plants making visibility and passage very difficult. Shovel tests adjacent to the site indicated a dark loamy soil over lighter brown to yellow-tan sandy loam. These soils are classified as Bonneau loamy sand, which are moderately well drained and nearly level soils.
Figure 14: Historic dam site, 38BK955.
The cemetery was initially discovered after noticing several "grave-like" depressions. Most of the graves are oriented east-west, parallel to each other in rows that run in a north-south direction. Some graves are spaced close together, while others are several meters apart, possibly indicating individual family plots. A few graves were placed randomly, not conforming to the orderly manner as the rest.

Sixteen graves were identified, although more may exist. Several amorphous depressions were observed in the area that may be graves. Three of the graves had tombstones. One was a granite footstone with no inscription. The other two were headstones; one was made of marble bearing the inscription: C. Leftenant, December 24, 19(?)9 (damaged) - July 22, 1916; the other was an unmarked stone. Judging from these tombstones, it appears the bodies are oriented with the heads to the east and the feet to the west (in true Christian fashion). Snowflake plants (Leucojum vernum) were growing among the graves, around the perimeter in a manner that suggests deliberate planting. These plants are often found in older cemeteries that predate the "perpetual"-care types of today's cemeteries. They appear to have been a favorite of all classes of people, probably in part due to their hardiness and ability to grow in all types of soils without maintenance, as well as their aesthetic appeal. Grave goods placed on top of a grave are common in Afro-American cemeteries in the lowcountry (Combes 1972), but none were noted here.
Site 38BK957, separated from the St. James churchyard cemetery that contains the graves of eighteenth and nineteenth century whites (mostly planters) (H.A.M. Smith in Waring, n.d: 68) and, more recently, the graves of prominent church officials on the west side of the 1931 brick wall, is a black cemetery. This was substantiated by Mrs. Simmons, who concurred with us that it was a black cemetery, though she did not know its history.

Whether site 38BK957 is the burial ground of the St. James Church slaves, slave communicants, or free blacks has not been determined at this time because concrete archival documentation has not been found. It is known that Negroes were communicants and attended church at St. James (Dalcho 1820: 247-260). It is also known that Dr. Francis Le-Jau, the first rector of the church, was a slave owner, as he refers to them in one of his letters to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in 1711. Other letters state that he conducted funeral services for blacks as well (Klingberg 1956: 81, 89, 198). In 1757, a Negro slave was presented to the parish for the use of the rector by a Mr. Peter Taylor (Dalcho 1820: 259). These references indicate that blacks played a significant role in the colonial history of St. James Church and that the first rector performed burial rites for them. However, no written information has been found indicating that blacks, either slaves or free, were buried on church property.

At present it can only be said that site 38BK957 is a historic cemetery (probably Afro-American), that was used during the early part of this century. The occurrence of early twentieth century black cemeteries located on colonial plantation sites has been observed in Berkeley County by the author and others (Martha Zierden, personal communication 1987), and some are shown on USGS Topographic Map, Huger Quadrangle (1971), Quimby Plantation. It is reasonable to think that these cemeteries are the burial grounds of eighteenth and nineteenth century slaves and that these cemeteries continued to be used by their descendants into the present century. Without archaeological evidence, which proper excavations should provide, or historical documentation, this can only be an assumption, albeit a very plausible one.

38BK959--Housesite #1

Site 38BK959 is located in tract 5 south of the overhead powerline that serves as the northern boundary of the tract (Fig. 3) and immediately east of County Road S-8-809. The site may have been partially destroyed by the construction or improvement of this road (Foster Creek Road), as cultural debris associated with 38BK959 was observed on the road's east bank adjacent to the site. This debris was apparently exposed by either the original grading of the road or perhaps more recent paving and maintenance. The dimensions of site 38BK959 are 30 meters x 30 meters.

This site was discovered during the subsurface testing of a slightly elevated sandy terrace situated in the flat pinelands of the tract. A thick understory growth of briars and other low growing vegetation was encountered, making survey difficult in the area of the site. Shovel tests revealed dark humic soil 6 to 10 cm in depth over yellow-tan sand, which continued between 30 to 50 cm below ground surface. At this point, shovel testing was discontinued when soil sterile of artifacts was reached. Artifacts were recovered from both soil zones. The soil at 38BK959 is classified as Bonneau loamy sand, which is nearly level, well drained, and occurs on broad ridges.

Artifacts recovered from subsurface testing at site 38BK959 consist primarily of architectural items and modern container glass (Table 4). A ceramic undecorated white ware sherd with a median date of 1860 and manufacturing range of 1820-1900+ (South 1978: 72) was recovered from this site. The artifacts recovered at 38BK959 suggest a domestic
occupation dating from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. This is substantiated by the inclusion of a house site in this area on the USGS Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map, 1919. Other domestic artifacts at 38BK959 suggest a low status occupation although further archaeological investigations and historical documentation is needed to evaluate the status of the individuals living at this site.

No above-ground structural remnants of a house were visible, but a well was located southeast of the apparent location of this house. This well measured 1.2 x 1.2 m and was constructed in a square fashion with only slightly rounded corners. The brick had collapsed at the ground surface, filling in the interior. (Fig. 4).

Twentieth century maps reveal a structure at this site as early as 1919 (USGS Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map), but no structure can be found on the 1958 USGS Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map. These map references are the only historical documentation that has been found concerning this site.

Artifactual evidence indicates a domestic structure was present on this site by the second decade of this century, although an earlier occupation date at the site during the late nineteenth century is conceivable. According to the maps, the structure was destroyed sometime after fieldwork was completed for the USGS Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map, 1919, but prior to the 1958 edition of the same map. It is possible that this site represents a tenant farmer, a renter, or a squatter, but more information is needed to determine the nature of this site. No deed records were found for this site, and neither vestryman Dr. Edward Parker nor the present caretaker of St. James Church, Mrs. Simmons, had any knowledge of anyone living there. The house was probably abandoned and subsequently torn down, possibly during logging activities that has taken place in this area in recent years.

38BK960--Vestry Building

Site 38BK960 is located 42 m in a northwesterly direction from the northwest corner of the brick wall that surrounds the St. James Church. The area of the house and associated cultural materials extend over an area 40 x 30 m, oriented in an east-west direction. The site was discovered during a visual inspection and concurrent with subsurface testing of the northern end of tract 7.

This site is situated on the same sandy ridge as the St. James Church (38BK59), the beginning of the old Colonial Road (38BK962), and the current home of the church caretaker, Mrs. E.G. Simmons. Site 38BK59 is surrounded by mature forest with a moderate understory that is rather dense in places. In the immediate vicinity of the site younger pines are found along with a variety of feral domestic species providing the understory. Shovel test excavations indicated a dark humus layer, varying in thickness, over a yellow-tan sand layer that overlies reddish-orange clay subsoil. The soils appear disturbed, probably by construction of the house, but also perhaps by logging activities indicated by many cut-off pine stumps in the area and shallow trenches or ditches that could have resulted from logs dragged out of the woods. Cultivation may also have occurred on this ridge, although no evidence of this activity was observed. Soils at this site are classified as Lucy loamy sand, which are nearly level to gently sloping and well-drained soils.
A visual inspection of the site located the foundations of a twentieth century house and associated well (Fig. 16). The house foundations measured 9.1 m in length (east-west) and 7.8 m in width; it apparently had a front porch (or possibly a separate room) on the south side with steps, which are still intact. A well measuring only 61 cm in outside diameter was located 20 m from the house foundation in a north-west direction. This well, an uncommonly small size and in good repair, is constructed of brick plastered with cement. As a well of such small size would prohibit construction from within, it would have been necessary to first excavate a large pit, apparently to a depth below the natural water level, then build a free standing brick well within this pit, then backfill the earth around the brick.

Artifacts from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were recovered from shovel tests dug into the fill of the twentieth century structure's foundations and in tests adjacent to the east end of the house foundation between this site and the old Colonial Road (38BK962). However, brick fragments of apparent early manufacture were recovered southeast of this site all the way to the west side of the brick wall that surrounds the St. James Church. Artifacts representing this earlier occupation are primarily architectural and domestic (Table 5; Fig. 17 and 18) items. Two eighteenth and nineteenth century ceramic sherds were recovered from this site (a very small sample) and a mean ceramic date (South 1978: 68-82) of 1801.5 was tabulated, suggesting a possible occupation of this site at the turn of the eighteenth century. No structural remnants, other than the mentioned scattered brick contemporary with these earlier artifacts were found above or below the surface of this site, but the level of investigation was too limited to preclude the possibility of a structure's existence.

Information provided by Mrs. Simmons indicated that there had been two structures located in the area designated as site 38BK960. She informed us that one structure had been the home of her parents and was torn down around 1960. She did not know when it had been constructed nor could she give explicit information about the earlier structure thought to have been located at this spot. She knew that an older building existed. Historical references substantiate her information: specifically, the watercolor of the church done by Charles Fraser about 1800 (in A Charleston Sketchbook, 1796-180, and the text of the 1940 reprint by Alice R. Huger Smith). Mrs. Smith refers to two structures in the area of site 38BK960. The one seen in the Fraser painting is the earlier of the two and should represent the vestry building, which was constructed in 1759 by Thomas Wright with materials provided by himself (Dalcho 1820; Waring 1909); the second, more recent structure was the home of the church sexton. This structure is mentioned in Smith's text when she indicates that the foundations of the 1759 vestry building could still be seen (in 1940) just in front of the sexton's house (Smith in Fraser 1959:17). A structure is shown in this area on the USGS Ladson S.C. Quadrangle Topographic Map, 1958; this structure is not shown on the 1970 revised edition, which does show the present Vestry Building.
Figure 17: Wrought nail, window glass, black spirit bottle frag, undecorated pearlware, tabby mortar.

Figure 18: Clear container glass w/threaded lip, window glass, wire nail, linoleum frag, plastic spray bottle apparatus.
Site 38BK960 can be considered a multicomponent archaeological site of the historic and prehistoric periods, although prehistoric artifacts are extremely sparse. The historic component is represented by the extant remains of one structure and artifactual evidence of another earlier existing one. The most recent structural remains represent the home of the church sexton and consist of the foundations of the house structure, a small well, and associated artifacts. The other historic component is represented by the artifactual remains apparently from the 1759 vestry building that once stood near the twentieth century structure.

The prehistoric component at site 38BK960 consists of only two artifacts: a single small unidentified pottery sherd and a small quartz primary flake. These artifacts probably represent no more than a periodic occupation of this ridgetop by small groups of aboriginal people for short periods of time. Subsequent construction of the two historic houses and logging activities have probably destroyed prehistoric site integrity.

38BK961

Site 38BK961 was discovered during subsurface testing at the top of a sandy ridge on the southern end of tract 7. This site is located on the west side of County Road S-8-809 (Foster Creek Road) and southwest of site 38BK957. The site's dimensions are 176 m east/west and 80 m north/south.

The ridge upon which 38BK961 is situated is covered by a mature forest with a moderate understory growth. Shovel test excavations indicate a topsoil layer of dark humus 15 cm in depth over yellow-tan sand. The soils of this site are classified as Bonneau loamy sand and Lucy loamy sand. These soils are nearly level, occur on broad ridges and are moderately well drained.

Artifacts recovered from 38BK961 consist of historic eighteenth century cultural materials and also some earlier prehistoric cultural materials (see Table 19 and Fig. 6). Historic materials include a single sherd of lead-glazed English slipware (date range 1670-1795 with a median date of 1733, South 1978:72) and numerous sherds of Colonoware. Artifacts were recovered primarily from the humus soil zone but some intruded into the yellow-tan sand below.

Colonoware, previously called Colonoindian ware (Ferguson 1978), is a low fired unglazed earthenware common to the South Carolina lowcountry. It is commonly found on early plantation sites. Colonoware is presumably a product of the eighteenth century (Ferguson 1978).
While the artifactual data recovered from this site are too small to ascertain the nature of this site, they appear to indicate a lower status occupation, possibly a slave dwelling. This is not unexpected, since it is known the church owned at least one slave in the 1750s (Waring 1909:14) and that individual rectors were slave owners (Heitzler 1983). In addition, it is known that rice growing areas of the glebe were leased out in the nineteenth century (Waring 1909), and it does not seem unlikely that this practice was known in the eighteenth century; glebe lands, after all, are for the support of the church. Therefore, the presence of resident slaves on this property, whether owned by the church or by lease holders, is not unlikely. The close proximity of site 38BK957, a probable black cemetery, lends support to the possibility of slave occupation at 38BK961.

Prehistoric artifacts recovered from site 38BK961 consist of widely scattered small pottery sherds (Table 6). The only identifiable pottery type was Deptford check stamped, a sandtempered ware from the Middle Woodland period (South 1976). These few artifacts indicate only sporadic occupations of this sandy ridgetop by aboriginal groups during the Middle Woodland period. The high ground and well drained soils of this sandy ridge should have attracted these cultures in the past, just as modern people tend to choose high, well drained home sites. It is somewhat surprising so little prehistoric evidence was recovered.
This site was discovered during subsurface testing on the northern end of tract 7 and in tract 10. Site 38BK962 is a historic road remnant that once connected St. James Church with the main road that crosses Goose Creek (now Old State Road). The site begins on the north side of Church Drive and runs in a northwesterly direction between site 38BK960 (ruins of the Sexton's house and earlier vestry building) and Mrs. Simmons' present-day residence 30 m to the east, and parallel to County Road S-8-809. The site continues towards the Old State Road, crossing an unnamed stream flowing from the east (boundary between tracts 7 and 10), and ends at County Road S-8-809 before reaching the Old State Road (Fig. 3). The dimensions of the site are interrupted in several areas by natural and cultural disturbances, but generally speaking, the site dimensions are approximately 7 meters in width, 400 m in length, and approximately 1 m below the adjacent ground surface, probably due to use, erosion, and perhaps attempts to level or grade it as well. It is seen on maps dating back to the late eighteenth century (the 1780 Bull/Gascoyne map is the earliest to show clearly this road) but segments of it have probably been in use for as long as the church has been in existence.

In the early years of the nineteenth century, Charleston artist Charles Fraser painted the church from the vantage point of this road. In the introduction of her edition of Fraser's "A Charleston Sketch book, 1796-1806," Alice Huger Smith states "There are still vestiges of the older road shown in this sketch (in 1940) which, after a well established Low Country custom, led squarely to the door of the church" (Smith 1959:17). Mrs. Simmons informed us that the road was still used as late as the 1940s, and trash of later vintage suggest a more recent use.

Site 38BK962 bisects two different topographical settings and soil types indicative of those settings. At its beginning on the east side of Church Drive, the road is near the crest of a sandy ridge upon which the St. James Church (38BK59), site 38BK960, and Mrs. Simmons' present residence are situated. This area of the site has a mature pine forest with some mixed hardwoods. Although a dense understory occurs in some spots in this area, it is relatively clear along the slopes of the ridge. Twentieth century domestic debris was found on the slopes of the ridge approaching Mrs. Simmons' house. A thinner scatter of debris extends along the slope on the west side of the old Colonial Road bed (38BK962) toward site 38BK960.

Shovel tests in areas adjacent to this portion of the road indicated a thin humus layer over a yellow-tan sandy layer over reddish-orange clay subsoil. The soils appear very disturbed, the cause is uncertain, but the area has been exposed to considerable use by humans for many years: construction of the early Colonial Road, subsequent construction of adjacent County Road S-8-809, at least three houses in the immediate vicinity, (the Sexton's house, vestry building, and the present home of Mr. Simmons) obvious logging activities, and possible cultivation that might have occurred on the top and slopes of this ridge in the past. These soils are classified as Lucy loamy sand, which is a nearly level, to gently sloping and well-drained soil.

This historical road remnant then crosses a drainage and low area designated as the boundary between tracts 7 and 10 before it crosses the toe of a second ridge. An undecorated white earthenware sherd (nineteenth-twentieth century) was recovered from the bed of the road remnant here. Shovel tests adjacent to the road revealed a thin zone of disturbed sandy loam over reddish-orange clay, but no cultural materials were discovered.
Again the road crosses a drainage and low area before it skirts the edge of a toe of high land. Subsurface testing in this area resulted in the recovery of thinly scattered nineteenth century ceramics, glass and nails. No evidence of structures was seen. It is believed that the cultural materials may be related to either the tavern, thought to have been located nearby, or a result of activities related to the building, use and maintenance of Goose Creek Bridge. They appear to be from a disturbed context, but this is uncertain based on the small test units excavated. Whether these, or some of these artifacts might have any association with the tavern supposed to have existed nearby could not be determined, although they are of the correct time period. The entire area has been occupied for so many years that it is difficult to determine when isolated finds are representative of a dwelling, or simply someone's garbage, without conducting extensive excavations. Until further archaeological investigations can be accomplished to determine the origin of these artifacts and their significance, they will be included arbitrarily as part of archaeological site 38BK962.

38BK889--Parsonage Site

Site 38BK889 is thought to be the parsonage of St. James Church in Goose Creek. If this is the case then the occupation of the site began around 1714 and lasted through the eighteenth century. The site is located east of County Road S-8-809 on a sandy ridge defined by two intermittent drainages. The drainage to the south of the site features a breached dam (site 38BK955). The drainage at the north of the site (Fig. 20), the northern boundary of tract 12, has been "channelized" (i.e. straightened and deepened for use as a drainage ditch) within the last two years (Joseph Ryder 1986: personal communication). The "Parsonage site," located between these two streams, has dimensions of 75 m in an east/west direction and 90 m north/south. The channelization process may have disturbed a feature or sheet refuse deposit in the basin of the drainage because of the number of artifacts found, their size and good condition. Thus it is unlikely that the spatial dimensions of this site are truly defined by this drainage. However, test excavations across the creek produced no artifacts, and the extreme disturbance of the area indicates that the areas of the site with the most integrity are south of the ditch (Fig. 20).

This site was recorded by Carl Steen (SCIAA) in September, 1986, after it was reported to him by a hobby diver, Joseph Ryder of Goose Creek. At that time artifacts were collected from the bottom of the north drainage ditch, but no investigation of the upland areas of the site was accomplished because permission from the landowner was not obtained, and because vegetation hindered access to the area. It was planned then that Ryder and Steen would contact the landowner and return during the winter of 1986/1987 to examine the site. This was precluded when the vestry of the church requested that a full survey of the church's property be conducted. During this survey the site was revisited and the remains of a substantial brick structure and at least three smaller brick structures were found. The drainage ditch was resurveyed and ceramic and glass sherd s were collected that were part of the same vessels collected by Steen and Ryder. One of the smaller brick structures produced late nineteenth/early twentieth century artifacts, but probably not related to the parsonage. The nature of this structure, and how it came to be on church property, is unclear, but it may represent an episode of squatters.

The upland area of the "Parsonage site," 38BK889, is covered with mature forest, predominantly large pine with some mixed hardwoods. The immediate area of the site is extremely overgrown with both wild and "feral" vegetation, most notably wisteria and privet hedge. Visibility is limited and passage is difficult.
Figure 20: The Parsonage site, 38BK889.
Subsurface testing was limited to small shovel tests, approximately 50 cm square, excavated to a depth where artifacts were no longer recovered. The primary value of these tests was in determining the presence or absence of artifacts, and in a very limited fashion, to give some idea of the length and time period of the occupation and the general condition of the site.

Test excavations revealed a layer of humus and topsoil varying in thickness from about 10-20 cm over a dark grey, poorly drained clayey loam. Soils are classified as "Duplin fine sandy loam," but the soils observed in test excavations are much too clayey and wet to fit this classification. The absence of well drained sandy soils remaining on this hilltop, or in some cases, a thin veneer as opposed to a considerable depth of these sandy soils in the adjacent lowlands to the south, indicates considerable erosion has taken place in the vicinity of this dwelling, moving these well-drained soils to the lowlands.

Artifacts recovered from both the shovel tests and the ditch collection indicate an occupation that was more intense in the eighteenth century than in subsequent times. Artifacts dating past the late eighteenth century include sherds of creamware, pearlware, and whiteware (Noel-Hume 1970:124-130). Earlier ceramics include both decorated and undecorated delftware, Chinese porcelain, lead glazed slipware, and salt glazed stonewares (Figs. 21-22). A mean ceramic date of 1772 was generated from the artifacts recovered from the shovel tests around the house. The mean ceramic date for the ceramics recovered from the ditch is 1737, but the date from all contexts combined was 1750. The combined mean ceramic date of 1750 compares well with the estimated median occupation date (South 1974:219) for the site. The median occupation date is simply the mid point of the occupation of the site. This is complicated to determine because the occupation of the site was probably not continuous, and it is unclear when the site was abandoned. The last regular minister for the church was the Reverend John Thompson, who served from 1806-1808 (Waring 1909:17). The minister prior to that was the Reverend Milward Pogson, who served from 1796-1806. Pogson probably did not live in the parsonage, however, since he was married to a wealthy Charleston woman, Henrietta Wragg (Waring 1909:17), who owned both plantations in the area (Drucker and Legg 1981:30) and townhouses in Charleston (Judith Wragg Chase 1983: personal communication). If the site's occupation began at around 1714 and ended around 1795 then the median occupation date for the site would be about 1753, which, as stated above, compares favorably with the site's mean ceramic date of 1750.

38BK59--St. James Church

Site 38BK59 is the edifice, yard, and cemetery of St. James Church in Goose Creek. This site had been recorded prior to the current survey (5/10/1970). The site is located on the crest of a sandy ridge having moderately well-drained soils classified as Bonneau loamy sand occurring on broad, nearly level ridges. The site area is cleared, but the surrounding area features a mature mixed forest with an occasionally thick understory. The boundary of the site, for the purposes of the state site from and National Register of Historic Places nomination, is a brick wall that surrounds the standing church, enclosing an area of approximately one-quarter acre. This wall was constructed in 1931 by the Colonial Dames of America (National Register Research File, S.C. Department of Archives and History, Andy Chandler, personal communication). The site was nominated to, and placed on, the NRHP in 1970, and was designated a National Landmark in 1983. Physical descriptions of the structure are drawn from the NRHP nomination from Joseph Waring's 1909 history of St. James Church, and Frederick Dalcho's 1820 history of the Episcopal Church in South Carolina.
Figure 21: Colonoware, window glass, upholstery tack, kaolin pipe stem and bowl frag, underglaze blue hand painted pearlware, Nottingham stoneware, wrought nail.

Figure 22: Black spirit bottle glass, mirror glass, tableware glass.
The present building, one of the oldest church buildings in the state, was built between 1714 and 1719 to replace an earlier wooden structure. The building is situated on part of a sixteen acre tract donated by Benjamin Godin (Waring 1909: 64-67, National Register File).

The one-story building is constructed of stucco-covered brick with a slate jerkin-head roof. It is rectangular and measures 50 feet by 40 feet. The corners of the building feature large quoins, and the slate roof is adorned at the eaves with a stucco cornice (National Register File).

Thirteen arched windows are framed with plaster, decorated with cherubs and are protected by exterior wooden shutters. The north and south sides are identical, with two windows on each side of a central entrance. The main (west) entrance is embellished with a frieze, featuring a Pelican, the symbol of piety, and a pediment; below is a door flanked by windows. The east end has a large window flanked by two smaller windows (National Register File).

In the interior, there is a center aisle and two side aisles enclosing two rows of panelled box pews. Solid pine columns stand in the corners of the side aisles. The ceiling is plaster, the highest point in the center. Tablets on the walls identify prominent parishioners within the church (National Register File).

Within the chancel are the raised pulpit, altar, and reading desk. A curved stairway leads to the pulpit, and a sounding board is suspended above. Behind the pulpit is a reredos bearing the Royal Arms of England (Fig. 21). On both sides of the chancel are marble tablets given by William Middleton in 1758. One bears the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed; the other bears the Ten Commandments (Dalcho 1820-250). In front of the chancel is the grave of the first rector, the Reverend Francis LeJau, D.D. Opposite the chancel is a wooden gallery over the west entrance. Stairs in the northwest corner provide access. Under the stairs is a small room (Figs. 23-24).

The church has been renovated several times. The more notable of these include the installation of metal rods for structural support in 1844, and the repair of the west wall, which collapsed during the 1886 earthquake. In 1955, a major restoration, based on historical research, was undertaken. This work included replacing the foundation, repairing all walls, replacing the decorations at the west entrance, and painting the exterior (National Register File).

There was no subsurface testing within the churchyard for fear of disturbing unmarked graves. However, a visual inspection and a random survey with metal detectors was conducted. Some tombstones were broken and/or fallen. The metal detectors located several fragments of aluminum foil, and a clay pot was found with foil attached. This foil probably was brought in when flowers were placed on graves. Several iron fragments and machine-cut nails were detected; these were likely to have been deposited during church renovations. Piles of construction debris were seen outside of the 1931 brick wall. These, too, were apparently associated with renovations. All of these items were noted and left in situ.

The interior of the church is in relatively good condition, with the exception of the cracking floor behind the chancel. The exterior of some of the shutters are rotting and hanging askew. The plaster framing the windows is cracking and some of the cherub’s heads are missing on the east end (Fig. 25).
Figure 23: Interior of the St. James Church: box pews, marble tablets, raised pulpit, sounding board overhead.

Figure 24: The chancel's reredos, bearing Royal Arms of England.
Figure 25: Exterior of St. James Church, showing the condition of the windows.

Bishop Haynsworth expressed (ref. ltr., May 3, 1988) that the floor level on the south end of the present church building is 6 inches below the ground level outside. A recent architectural study has indicated that this needs to be corrected for the safety of the building. Some correction to the outside level is indicated, which would need further scrutiny for protection of archaeological resources, if any land-altering is planned.
ARTIFACT ASSEMBLAGES AND DATA

Determining Mean Ceramic Date (South 1974)

The mean ceramic date (South 1974) for pottery of the historic period is determined by assigning a value (the median manufacture date for a particular ware) to each sherd, and multiplying that by the number of sherds. The products are then totaled and divided by the total number of sherds. The resulting figure gives a fairly accurate estimate of the mid-point of the occupation at the site. For example: if one sherd of pearlware (median date 1805) and two sherds of lead glazed slipware (median date 1733) are collected, the products are 1805 and 3,466. Added together these equal 5,271. Divide this by three and the mean ceramic date is 1757. More specific dating is obtainable through intensive analysis and research of various artifacts, but the mean ceramic date is a good method of arriving at a date for the site as a whole.

TABLE 1
38BK956--PREHISTORIC ASSEMBLAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thoms Creek Punctate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 BC-500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Check Stamp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 BC-600 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Fear Series Cordmarked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>400 AD-1300 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Simple Stamp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Fragments</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Plain Chert.</td>
<td>Tert. Fakes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthoquartzite.</td>
<td>Tert. Flakes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthoquartzite.</td>
<td>Hafted Biface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2000 BC-1000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthoquartzite.</td>
<td>Tert. Flakes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siltstone</td>
<td>Chunk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>Shatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>Primary Flake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
<td>Fire Cracked Rock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38BK956--Historic Artifact Assemblage

Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Annular wares&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1900+</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Ceramics Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machine Cut Nails</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Flat Iron Frag.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick/fired Clay Fragment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2

38BK958--PREHISTORIC ASSEMBLAGE

Pottery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CULTURAL DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Fear Series Cordmarked</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400 AD-1300 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Check Stamp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000 BC-600 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoms Creek Punctate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2000 BC-500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallings Island Plain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2500 BC-800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Fragments</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

38BK955--HISTORIC DAM

No artifacts were recovered from this site.

38BK957--HISTORIC CEMETERY

No artifacts were recovered from this site.

---

TABLE 4

38BK959--HOUSE SITE # 1

Historic Artifact Assemblage

Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1900+</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Ceramic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortar Fragments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Fragments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass Fragments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Shingle Fragments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Tack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Nails With Common Head</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nail Fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge Part</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular Iron Object (Possible Door Knob Part)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Container Frag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Iron Frag</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Rubber Frag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Frag</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brown Bottle Glass Frag. 1. Undetermined
Clear Container Glass Frag. 15. Undetermined

TABLE 5
38BK960--20th CENTURY VESTRY BUILDING
Artifact Assemblage

Non-Ceramic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick Fragments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Mortar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Nail With Common Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nail Shank/Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Decorative or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Spray Bottle Apparatus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linoleum Frag.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38BK960--18th Century Vestry Building Component

Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated Pearllware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Yellow Creamware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1775-1820</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date: 1801-5

Non-Ceramic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabby Mortar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwrought Nail With Rose Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Clear Decorative or Tableware Glass** .......................................................... 1........................................................ Undetermined
"Black" Spirit Bottle Glass.................................................................................. 4........................................................ Undetermined
Light Green Pharmaceutical Glass........................................................................ 1........................................................ Undetermined
Window Glass........................................................................................................ 9........................................................ Undetermined
Oystershell Fragments............................................................................................. 1........................................................ Undetermined
Plaster...................................................................................................................... 5........................................................ Undetermined

38BK960—Prehistoric Component

**Artifact Assemblage**

**Pottery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CULTURAL DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lithics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CULTURAL DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>Primary flake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6**

38BK961—HISTORIC ARTIFACT ASSEMBLAGE

**Ceramics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Glazed Slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1670-1795</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonoware</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Ceramic Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick/Fired Clay Fragments</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwrought Nail Shanks (1 With T-head, 1 With Unid. Head)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nail Shanks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1 With Head)........................................ 2........................ Undetermined
"Black" Spirit Bottle Glass........................... 1........................ Undetermined
Kaolin Pipe Bowl Fragments.......................... 1........................ Undetermined
Oystershell Fragments................................ 6........................ Undetermined

38BK961--Prehistoric Artifact Assemblage

Pottery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Check Stamp.........</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000 BC-600 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Simple Stamp........</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000 BC-600 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified fragments.......</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 7

38BK962--OLD HISTORIC ROAD

Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated Whiteware........</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1900..............</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Printed whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1900..............</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware Glaze Chip.........</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1900..............</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Ceramic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Black&quot; Spirit Bottle Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass.........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Green Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass..........</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Iron Frag........</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nail Fragments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Cut Nail Shanks......</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nail Shanks.....</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Frag....................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
38BK889--PARSONAGE SITE

Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Delftware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1600-1802</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain White Delftware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1640-1800</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overglaze Enamelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1660-1800</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Devon Gravel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempered Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1650-1775</td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Glazed Slipware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1670-1795</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1700-1810</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded White Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1720-1805</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underglaze Blue Hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Pearlware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1780-1820</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated Pearlware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green-Edged Pearlware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1795-1840</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1900</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Ceramic Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1772.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Ceramics Not Used In Mean Ceramic Date Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delftware Bisque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-Gray Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Earthenwares</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Burnt Earthenwares</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colono-indian Ware</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Non-Ceramic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick/Fired Clay Frag</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabby Mortar Frag</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nail Shanks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwrought Nail Shanks (Two With &quot;T&quot; Heads)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Iron Frag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Shell Casing, (Probably 22 Cal.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Furniture Tack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Black&quot; Spirit Bottle Glass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## TABLE 9

### HISTORIC ARTIFACT ASSEMBLAGE RECOVERED FROM CREEK

#### Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Glazed Slipware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1670-1795</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain White Delftware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1640-1800</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimosa Pattern Delftware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1710-1740</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Brown Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1690-1775</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip Dipped White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1715-1775</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underglaze Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1660-1880</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighter Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1775-1820</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilded Edge Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1900</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date: 1737

#### Other Ceramics Not Used In Mean Ceramic Date Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CULTURAL DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonoware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Ceramic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Black&quot; Spirit Bottle Glass</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Mean Ceramic Date for Artifacts Recovered from Parsonage Site and Adjacent Creek .......................................................... 1750

TABLE 10

38BK889--LATE 19th-20th CENTURY LOCI

Historic Artifact Assemblage

Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEDIAN DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated Whiteware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1820-1900</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Ceramic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Iron Frag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nail Fragments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Cut Nail Shank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Frag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38BK59- ST. JAMES CHURCH

No artifacts were recovered from this site.
SITE RECOMMENDATIONS

38BK59--St James Church

Further archaeological investigations at site 38BK59 could reveal unmarked graves, foundations of associated buildings, and the remains of the "wooden church" of the 1706-1714 period. It is considered very likely that unmarked graves are present, and care should be taken that subsurface disturbances do not impact them. If underground lines are planned, SCIAA should be contacted preceding excavations. It is less likely that the remains of the wooden church and any outbuildings associated with the church are present in any interpretable form within the walls of the churchyard, but nevertheless, the possibility of their presence should be considered in the planning stages of any ground disturbing activities.

St. James Church was nominated to, and placed on, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 1970 and was designated a National Landmark in 1983.

38BK889--Parsonage Site

Site 38BK889 is probably the brick parsonage associated with the St. James Church. These ruins should be considered as an integral part of the church's history. This site presents some intriguing topics for research, since it is virtually the first site (in S.C.) of its kind to receive any attention from an archaeological standpoint. Previous historical archaeological research in the low country of South Carolina has dealt with upper (planter) and lower (slave/overseer) status plantation sites, military sites, and urban sites. This site differs in that it is a site that was occupied at an early date, for a limited period, by an upper-status white person (or family) that did not necessarily rely on slavery for their subsistence, and few, if any, slaves were residents of the site. Thus it can be expected to reflect a more "pure" Euro-American adaptation to the New World. As such this site can be used as a control for the comparison of white and slave occupations on plantation and other domestic sites, and thus could help us to understand more clearly the contributions of both groups to the cultural development of the South Carolina low country.

At present this site is in no apparent danger, but the rapid spread of the Goose Creek community, and related road building, drainage modification, installation of powerlines, among many other possible impacts, could change this situation rapidly. An impact not to be discounted is idle "treasure hunting" by local metal detector buffs. As Goose Creek has grown this type of destructive behavior has increased. Site 38BK889 is a unique and valuable cultural resource that should be protected at all costs.

Preliminary investigations indicate archaeological site 38BK889 meets criteria for inclusion to the NRHP.
38BK955--Historic Dam

As with site 38BK962 the value of a dam alone is limited, but as a part of the larger glebe site, it has considerable interpretive value. It also has possibilities for inclusion into any plans for a park or historic interpretive trail through the church properties.

The possibility of placing this dam on the National Register of Historic Places would probably depend on a better definitions of its use and association with St. James Church and parsonage.

38BK956--Prehistoric Site

One of only two prehistoric sites discovered during the survey, this site covers an area of 300 m x 300 m. Approximately two-thirds of the site is located in areas that have been logged and replanted in recent decades. The site within these logged-over areas appears to have been highly disturbed. Additional archaeological research in these disturbed areas is not justified. Fortunately, these disturbed areas represent the perimeters of the site. The site area where subsurface testing showed the greatest density of prehistoric activity appears to have suffered relatively little disturbance. This opinion is admittedly based on the overall appearance of the surrounding forest with its abundance of large trees, giving the impression that the area has been disturbed very little, at least from human use, in many decades. Test excavations conducted during the survey were limited so more testing would be necessary to substantiate this position.

Subsurface test excavations point to an occupation of the site throughout the Woodland period (3,000 B.P.-1,300 B.P.). Sites occupied by Indians preceding the Woodland period generally deposit less cultural remains as evidence. It is possible that earlier people did periodically occupy this site, but limited testing during this survey to substantiate an earlier occupation was unsuccessful.

Provisions should be made to conduct archaeological excavations prior to implementing any plans for development or other activities that would alter the integrity of this site. Such plans should extend testing the possibility of subsurface features existing, such as structural evidence, garbage dumps, burials, etc.

Without further archaeological documentation, the eligibility of this site for inclusion on the NRHP is impossible to predict.

38BK957--Historic Cemetery

No archival documentation has been found to confirm or disconfirm this site's association with the nearby St. James Church. If archival research is unsuccessful, then archaeological investigations would provide more information, perhaps linking this historic cemetery to St. James Church.

That the cemetery is not in direct association with the church should not be the sole criterion for the cemetery's NRHP eligibility. The site's history can be determined, making the cemetery eligible for NRHP on its own merits.

To establish the identity of this historic cemetery, first, a more thorough archival research should be accomplished. If the cemetery's identity can be established in this
manner, then archaeological excavations would be unnecessary. Failing this, excavations should be conducted to determine the site's spatial and temporal extent, cultural affiliation and possible association with the St. James Church. During this phase, the site's eligibility for inclusion to the NRHP could be determined.

38BK958--Prehistoric Site

This site is a small pottery and lithic scatter with cultural debris ranging from the Late Archaic through the Late Woodland period (4,500 B.P.-1300 B.P.).

Subsurface test excavations indicate that this site is highly disturbed with no apparent archaeological integrity. These prehistoric cultural remains probably eroded from higher adjacent landforms when the land was cleared and cultivated.

Further archaeological research at this site is unwarrantable and is not recommended for inclusion to the NRHP.

38BK959--Late 19th-Early 20th Century House

Artifactual data recovered from test excavations indicate this site was a rural home, one of many throughout this area. It is difficult to argue a case for preserving this particular site, or for recommending additional archaeological research, unless the vestry desires to establish who lived there and any possible association with the church. These ruins are not eligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places.

38BK960--Vestry Building

The Simmons house/vestry building is an integral part of the history of St. James Church. The boundaries of the Simmons house were established during the survey, but efforts to define the limits of the vestry building were less successful. The vestry building is historical, regrettably, the time frame for the survey did not allow a more intensive effort to define these ruins.

At present, these ruins should be protected, particularly from vandals looting the site. If the church should formulate plans to develop a park/interpretive historic area for the public, then it might be wise to consider additional archaeological research oriented toward incorporating the role of these particular ruins into the overall scheme of the church's history.

These ruins are just outside the existing National Register boundaries of the St. James Church and could easily be incorporated. The mutual history of these buildings as support for this famous church, and the possibility of yielding additional information about the functions of the church, should make them eligible for the National Register.
38BK961--Possible Slave Dwelling

The archaeological remains of this site are all subsurface, and due to limited testing during the survey, much information was unobtainable. These ruins have exciting possibilities for future research, both from an archival and archaeological perspective. There is a good possibility this site represents an occupation by Afro-Americans and possibly Indians from the early 18th century. Both races are mentioned in the church's history. Some of the Negros are mentioned as being church slaves or as being ministered to by the church. An early objective of the church was to minister to the Indians.

The life of these people is not documented historically to the fullest extent, perhaps in some case, not including full coverage of slave dwelling places or burials. This site is possibly a dwelling place for some of these people. As such, the site should be considered for future archaeological research. Additional research would confirm/disconfirm this site as a place of their dwelling, and association with the church. Research would be necessary to consider this site for the NRHP.

38BK962--Old Colonial Road

The value of a road bed alone as an archaeological site is questionable, but as part of a larger plan of site interpretation, it could be valuable. Since this road dates at least to the late 18th century, it would have been used by many of the parishioners and visitors to the parish. Thus walking along this road one is truly walking in the footsteps of some of the most important figures in South Carolina's history, including for instance, Arthur Middleton, signer of the Declaration of Independence. With minimal effort the road bed could be cleared and used as a nature trail since it crosses both upland and lowland environments that feature a variety of types of vegetation and wildlife habitats. It would easily fit into any plans for a park/interpretive trail through church property.
SUMMARY

An archaeological survey and evaluation of the cultural remains located on St. James Church property near Goose Creek was requested by the Episcopal Diocese in order to plan for the future use of this land.

The primary objectives of the archaeological survey were to locate, identify, evaluate and record structures or sites within the church property, and to recommend plans for maintaining the site's integrity and protection, and mitigating any adverse effects to these archaeological remains. SCIAA welcomed the opportunity to explore this historic property and perhaps expand its prestigious history.

Most of the land that makes up the St. James Church property has been in the hands of the vestry since ca. 1704. The almost exclusive use of this land (in historic times), for functions of the church, offers a somewhat unique opportunity to explore local history from a perspective different than that most often available in history textbooks.

In the rural South Carolina low country, where towns sometimes failed to develop, parishes such as St. James Church in Goose Creek were the center of a frontier community. The church served as an institution for education and socialization, not only for children, but for adults as well. Adults voted here also. The parish boundaries marked the political divisions of South Carolina during most of the eighteenth century. The contributions of the early ministers, such as the Reverend LeJau, are outstanding and fairly well documented. The lives of the less prominent, or perhaps less literate, citizens are more obscure.

Prior to conducting this survey two archaeological sites were already recorded in SCIAA site files within the boundaries of the St. James property: St. James Church (site 38BK59) and the ruins of what is considered as the second parsonage (site 38BK889). Six other historic sites were added to this list during the survey. These sites include structural remains of the Vestry Building and possibly an earlier vestry building (site 38BK960). An earthen dam (site 38BK955), which may have served as a rice reserve, or garden pond, was recorded. A late nineteenth/early twentieth century domestic site was discovered (38BK959). No archival records of this site were found. A cemetery (site 38BK957) was located and recorded. This site was not part of the main cemetery of the church. It could have been a slave grave site, or possibly where free blacks were buried. An eighteenth century lower status domestic site (site 38BK961) was discovered. This may have been the home of one of the slaves. Documentary evidence reveals that the church owned slaves. An old road bed (site 38BK962) leading from near the front of the church to the Charleston/Goose Creek road, dates at least to the late eighteenth century and probably to the earliest days of the church.

Two previously unknown prehistoric sites were discovered (sites 38BK956 and 38BK958) and recorded, bringing the total of archaeological sites discovered during this survey to eight.

St. James Church (38BK59) is already on the National Register of Historic Places. Others, such as the parsonage (38BK889), the Vestry Building remains (38BK960), the newly discovered cemetery (38BK957), and the possible slave dwelling (38BK961), following neccessary archival and archaeological investigations, should meet criteria for inclusion to the National Register.
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The historic dam (38BK955) and the old colonial road (38BK962), although visible reminders of the eighteenth century, are not likely to yield information important enough for inclusion to the NRHP, but the sites could be eligible under another category: association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns in South Carolina history. The road apparently was the main road leading directly to the church.

The archaeological potential of prehistoric site 38BK956 cannot be determined without further excavations. Tests from the survey have yielded important information about South Carolina's prehistoric inhabitants and has further potential.

Prehistoric site 38BK958 and historic site 38BK959 (nineteenth-twentieth century house) appear to have little to offer in the way of useful information to add to what is known of the cultural periods they represent, and it is doubtful either would meet criteria for inclusion to the National Register.

Two hundred fifty years of exposure to high moisture and acidic soils has probably obliterated any evidence of remains of the wooden church and parsonage that predates the present structures. No structures, except for those recorded, were found and it is unlikely that any identifiable remains of these buildings now exist.

The tavern shown on Mills Atlas of 1820 was not located. Scatters of artifacts from the early nineteenth century were found in the area shown on the atlas, but no ruins of this structure were discovered, perhaps due to recent highway modifications in the immediate vicinity displacing the evidence.

In conclusion, this archaeological survey has established an occupational history of the Goose Creek St. James Church property. The archival record was expanded after recording the prehistoric occupations, slave dwellings and cemeteries, creating a data base with which to examine regional and local ideological institutions in the colonial development of South Carolina.
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