A Community of Households: the Early 19th-Century Enslaved Community at James Madison's Montpelier

Substance and Context

Introduction

Over the next three years, the Montpelier Foundation[1] plans to conduct archaeological investigations of various households that were part of the early 19th-century (1810s – 1830s) enslaved community at Montpelier. Three different living areas for the enslaved community have been identified in Montpelier's 1,250-acre historic core that in the early 19th century was called the Home Quarter[2]: 1) The South Yard - the quarters for house slaves who resided within the formal grounds of the mansion, 2) The Stable quarter - a set of quarters associated with the operations of the mansion household which appear to have included those enslaved individuals working as gardeners or in the stables and 3) The Field quarter - the quarters for field slaves located in the heart of the working complex for the Home Quarter (Figure 1). The relationship between the location of these sites and the assumed work role of household occupants is consistent with numerous studies that have shown a slave's "occupation" typically determined his or her place of residence (Genovese 1976; Pogue 2002; Reeves 2003). It is the spatially distinct location of these three quarters that provides the comparative contrast between these households in terms of the style of housing, yard organization, and material goods recovered from the archaeology proposed by this study.

Previous surveys conducted at Montpelier identified multiple house remains for these three areas, which are all remarkably well preserved in unplowed contexts. Initial excavations have revealed large quantities of household goods (ceramics, glass bottles, animal bone, and personal items) and well-preserved living surfaces and features including yard hearths, structural remains (architectural items, chimney bases and structure footings), graveled yard surfaces, and paths. The three residential quarters thus provide a remarkable opportunity to compare and contrast slave life at the plantation home of the fourth president of the United States. The deposits from all of these sites date to the late 1810s through the 1830s, and provide a discrete occupation period for study. The utility of household comparison became clear through the contrasts that were immediately evident between the field- and house-slave settlements in initial site testing.

[1] James Madison's Montpelier is a property of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP). The Montpelier Foundation is a private non-profit 501(c)(3) set up in 2000 through a co-stewardship agreement with the NTHP to manage the financial and physical operations of the property.

[2] During the early 19th century, there were at least four Quarters (or divisions) making up the plantation lands of the Madison family. The quarter known historically as the "Home Quarter" was the 1250 acres of the original land patent that surrounded the Madison's main dwelling, Montpelier, and is the subject of this study. For this proposal, when discussing the working division of land, the Quarter will be capitalized, but for areas of residence, such as Field quarter, quarter will be lowercase.

The Field quarter residences for field slaves showed a marked difference from the South Yard in both built architecture and access to household goods (ceramics, glasswares, clothing items, etc). Initial excavations revealed the quarters for house slaves in the South Yard were frame structures featuring brick chimneys, glazed windows, and raised wooden floors. In contrast, the quarters for field slaves were log structures with stick and mud chimneys, no glazed windows, and dirt floors. The material possessions found in the South Yard also revealed higher access to material goods with a wider range of ceramics, glasswares, and personal items than found in the field quarters. These initial observations of material life support the stereotypical view (created by planters) that house slaves had a higher quality of life than field slaves—an assumption that historians have shown to be false (Fox-Genovese 1988; Genovese 1976; hooks 1992). What is devoid from such strictly material comparisons is the complex interplay of social relations that existed within and between households of a community and the labor role to which individuals were assigned. The third set of quarters, the Stable quarter, bridges this "gap" by providing a context to contrast the material extremes seen in the quarters of the field and the house slaves. At this quarter, initial observations have shown that while structures were more similar to those found in the field quarters, household goods more closely aligned to those recovered in the house quarters. By contrasting many households set within a larger community, we hope to develop an understanding of the larger community institutions that had been established by Montpelier's enslaved community—whether these institutions be informal trading networks, the organization of established domestic work areas to support individual household needs, or the means of creating privacy within the home place from the pervasive influence and surveillance of the plantation owners. Uncovering such community activities necessitates establishing a historic context and comparative methodology that takes into account patterning within individual households and the larger plantation infrastructure.

The historic context of Montpelier makes an especially compelling case study in terms of what is known about the Madison family's activities during their retirement years at Montpelier (1817-1836)--the time period for this study. Particularly interesting is how these activities impacted life in the South Yard. The South Yard complex was located within the mansion's formal landscape or the "pleasure grounds" for the estate. Prior to retiring from the White House, the Madisons designed this area to serve as an entertaining space that featured neo-classical landscape elements and a completely renovated home set within a picturesque landscape design. Within this formal space is the South Yard or quarters for house slaves. Copious letters document the use of this area and the interaction between Madison's guests and his slaves. In addition, previous archaeology carried out on the formal landscape at Montpelier has provided a key to understanding this portion of the site. As will be detailed below, this context sets the stage for comparison of the households in the South Yard with those of other parts of the plantation community and provides an interpretive focus to ferret out the many aspects of slaves' domestic lives that

were both under and out of the range of direct controls by the Madison family.

Given the myriad of issues associated with making a viable study of the three segments of the slave community at Montpelier, it is necessary to employ a holistic methodology that considers the complex interplay between owner and individual groups of slaves, the demands slavery placed on all enslaved people regardless of labor role, and the social dynamics of the enslaved community. Relying on the everyday material remains found at individual quarters is not enough. Rather, what is needed is a means to compare and contrast these remains in a structured manner that takes into consideration the specific historic context of the Montpelier plantation and the social dynamics inherent within a plantation community based on chattel slavery. To approach this challenge, we propose a methodology whose base unit of analysis is the household (the level provided through the archaeological record). The shift in focus to the household is one that many archaeologists of the African Diaspora have made over the past two decades—moving away from simplistic ideas of African continuities and patterns of material culture to analyses that engage everyday-lived experiences set within a holistic contextual approach (Battle 2004; Armstrong 1990; Franklin 1997; Reeves 1997; 2010; Wilkie and Farnsworth 1999, 2005). What makes this study unique is how we approach the household—that is, through the overarching context of community.

Montpelier's study will ascertain action at the level of the household, and consider how this action is set within a larger community framework defined by a web of social relations linking households on a myriad of levels: community, plantation, and region. Material remains (taking the form of household items, differences in architectural styles, and organization of yards) within the three residential quarters will be analyzed to determine the similarities and differences that existed between households across the plantation community. Differences and similarities between households should reflect the relationship of individual households to each other, the community to which they belong, their relationship to the plantation in general, and regional patterns of both market access and cultural traditions[3]. This project will pursue an analysis of material remains that moves between the interconnected vertices of household, community, plantation, and region. Moving between these varying scales of analysis will help put into context patterns seen in the material record of individual households. Such a comparison not only allows for consideration of the impact that labor roles had on slaves' everyday lives, but also moves beyond simplistic causal relationships (such as the direct link between labor role and material lives of individual households) towards an analysis of the interplay of community

[3] In using the term cultural traditions, I am lumping together a multitude of lifeways ranging from building traditions, yard practices, foodways, and other material aspects associated with African Americans in the Virginia Piedmont during the early 19th century.

life on labor structure (Reeves 1997)[4]. While the focus is on the community at Montpelier, a critical part of this comparative analysis includes an understanding of the larger patterns observed by scholars of the African Diaspora---both for the local region and the wider Atlantic World. Before detailing the methodological underpinning for this study, it is necessary to introduce the enslaved households being examined. It is through understanding the actors considered by this study that the proposed methodology can be illuminated.

The households under study

Making comparisons within any plantation community is a complex undertaking. The proposed study will examine three different groups within the enslaved community: the house slaves, field slaves, and slaves from "skilled" occupations. What connects all of these households and defines them in terms of their role as laborers is the owner household, in this case the Madison family. In any household analysis involving enslaved communities, the dominance of the owner, both in terms of prerogative, agenda, and motivating experience must always be kept in the forefront as this defined the experience of slaves in any given historical context (Berlin and Morgan 1993:1). In this regard, it is very advantageous that the Madisons' home, lifestyle, attitudes towards slavery, and political views have been researched and examined by historians for decades (Ketchum 1990, 2009; McCoy 1980; Meyers 1981; Slaughter 1970). In addition, excavations and landscape studies conducted over the past eight years at Montpelier (Reeves 2007; Brown 2006) have enabled an accurate reconstruction for the appearance of the Madisons' mansion grounds. Understanding this overarching context has proven to be critical in conceptualizing the experience of enslaved families at Montpelier, not only for the slaves living inside the mansion grounds (namely the house slaves) but, in a comparative context, for the rest of the enslaved community as well. It is for this reason we start with the landscape context of the enslaved households associated with Montpelier's main house.

Prior to his retirement from the presidency in 1817, Madison arranged to have the grounds around the home radically altered from his parents' Georgian style to a more Picturesque landscape. This new landscape featured a neoclassical layout and landscape elements, serpentine paths, plantings with directed

[4] For this study, the sense of community is defined along the lines of Roseberry in which members of a community are seen as group with common interests set within an economic framework of competing interests (in this case plantation slavery) (Roseberry 1966). Rather than seeing community as unified, however, this study will seek the social relations inherent among a set of households who have both competing interests and commonalities both inside and outside of their core context. As such, the concept of scales of influence come into play with each household being viewed as a separate component and whose relationship to larger organizational concepts (community, plantation, and region) can be established through material patterning.

views, and formal gates marking the arrival into the mansion grounds (Reeves 2007). The boundaries of these formal grounds were demarcated in a distinctive manner through the use of fences, roads, ha-has[5], and plantings. These borders formed the perimeter of the mansion curtilage, the immediate grounds surrounding the house that define the formal landscape (Lounsbury 1999), which at Montpelier encompassed a five-acre area of land that was part of the intimate space for the Madisons' entertaining activities. Within the boundaries of the curtilage are the following elements: a formal terraced garden; a temple set at the end of a pine tree allée; a massive, level, two-acre green on the rear lawn which served for garden fetes; and an elaborate picket fence within which was set a distinctive gate leading to the front portico of the house (Brown 2006; Reeves 2007) (Figure 2). Within the house, the landscape was meant to be incorporated into various interiors such as the drawing room with its three triple-hung windows, multiple terraces from which the surrounding grounds could be viewed, and windows strategically positioned to look out upon key elements of the built landscape. Our understanding of this landscape is enhanced by accounts from visitors to Mr. and Mrs. Madison from the late 1810s-1830s. These letters and diaries recall the entertainment provided by the Madisons and the distinctive style of the Madison household both in terms of interior furnishings and garden design (Miller 2002; Reeves 2007). Within the formal confines of these grounds, the enslaved community held a distinctive role and place.

The house slaves for the Madisons resided in a set of quarters that were located within the defined curtilage for the mansion. While having quarters set adjacent to the main house is not unusual for the time period, what is unique is that available documentary and archaeological evidence suggests these quarters were incorporated into the overall landscape design for the intimate space of the formal rear lawn. In other words, these quarters were not only in direct sight from the mansion, but were also meant to be part of the overall pleasure grounds attached to the mansion. Our first evidence for the early 19th-century quarters for house slaves was found through excavations that were carried out in the early 1990s—these excavations uncovered the remains of a brick chimney base with a double-sided hearth suggestive of a duplex. Excavations revealed prodigious quantities of window glass, door hardware, and other items suggesting a more refined house structure. About 10 years later, our understanding of how this structure related to the rest of the landscape was revamped through the discovery of an 1837 insurance map that showed the full extent of outbuildings in the South Yard. This insurance map shows three duplexes (one of which matches the exact location of the chimney base discovered in 1992), two smokehouses, the stable, and a detached kitchen. In 2008, we carried out test excavations along the eastern line of structures and found incredibly well preserved remains of another chimney base for a

[5] Ha-has are a form of "sunken fence" whereby a wall and ditch are used to keep animals out of the formal pleasure grounds for an estate. Such a landscape device allowed unbroken views between the formal grounds and the surrounding landscape (Lounsbury 1999).

domestic quarter (this time stone), yard surfaces, fence lines, and large quantities of artifacts that verified the existence of the structures shown in the 1837 insurance plan and the excellent preservation present across this domestic complex (Figure 3).

Combining archaeological evidence of the quarters in the South Yard with documentary accounts provided us with an interesting perspective on this space. What the insurance map suggested was that these quarters were valuable enough to be insured as property along with the house. The presence of brick chimneys with raised hearths suggested these structures had raised wooden floors, the window glass suggested sash windows, and the door hardware suggested a defined trimwork and finishing for the structures. Initial testing of yard areas suggested that trash deposition was kept confined to areas out of sight from the main house. Taken in tandem, what these finds suggest is these quarters were meant to be seen from the house. Views from the mansion's south terrace balcony and rear lawn support this as one looks directly into the heart of the living complex (Figure 4). That these quarters were meant to be part of the formal space is also supported by visitors' accounts wherein Madison's guests recall visiting the quarters following breakfast and bringing leftovers as gifts to present to the elderly slaves in this space (Miller 2002:72). The direct interaction of Madison's guests with these quarters as part of the pleasure grounds must have placed the households residing in this portion of the Montpelier community in a vulnerable position with actions being monitored and under close scrutiny on a daily basis.

Our understanding of the living and working space for the enslaved domestics was enhanced by our excavations of the service complex in and around the mansion from 2002-2006. These excavations revealed direct evidence that that the paths we had found through remote sensing in the South Yard connected not only the various structures of this space with each other, but physically connected the South Yard complex with the mansion. These paths provided slaves access into the cellars of the mansion, which in turn provided discrete access into the first floor of the house through service stairs. The flow of materials and activities into the mansion cellars was highlighted during our excavations of the cellar spaces within the mansion. From 2004-2006, we excavated the entirety of the mansion cellar floor area—this area was a well-preserved archaeological context due to the duPont family (who purchased the property in 1901) arranging for a concrete floor to be poured across this entire space. This concrete sealed the remains of 18th- and early 19th-century wall partitions, sub-floor pits, floor treatments, hearths, domestic deposits, and other features relating to sleeping areas, work spaces, and storage areas. These features provided rich information on the use of space within the mansion cellars (Tinkham and Reeves 2008, see webpage http://montpelier.org/explore/archaeology/cellars.php). The discrete nature of the work areas in the cellar, a space in which slaves could work and sometimes socialize out of sight from the Madison family and their guests, was in complete contrast with the direct views into the slave families' spaces at the South Yard service complex. However, the Madisons' expectations for the ever-present

services of the enslaved domestics meant even these cellar areas were kept under strict surveillance—a pattern seen among many Virginia great houses of the time period (Epperson 1999; Upton 1988).

The combined context of the South Yard being set within the formal grounds of the mansion and at the same time being directly tied with the service complex of cellars and spaces of the mansion make the living area for Montpelier's house slaves an incredibly volatile and complex set of spaces. The presence of the smokehouses reminds us that yard spaces of the homes would be used for daily labor such as processing food for storage, laundering, repairing items from the house—all activities being closely scrutinized by the mistress of the house (Vlach 1987). At the same time, these spaces were seen as visual points of interest by the Madisons' guests and all activities were likely expected to conform to the surrounding ordered landscape.

One question that arises with the placement of the slave homes within the formal landscape of the mansion is whether this location was inspired by the idealized worker housing movement going on in England during this same time period. Period garden books, most especially during the picturesque movement, provide designs for idealized worker housing (Williamson 1999 and Delle 1999). The layout of slave housing at Montpelier with central chimneys and dimensions of 20ft x 30ft is very reminiscent of designs by gentleman planters in England and their recommendations for influencing workers (see Kent 1775 and Wood 1781). What makes the homes for house slaves such a fascinating comparison with their brethren in the field quarters is the disparate architectural traditions used between the two portions of Montpelier's enslaved community.

Excavations carried out in the quarters for field slaves at Montpelier have revealed a very different set of structures from those in the formal grounds at the mansion. Initial surveys at the "Field quarter" less than a quarter mile from the mansion, have shown these homes to be log structures with stick and mud chimneys (based on no appreciable brick, stone or mortar at the site), clay floors (based on lack of footers), unglazed windows (very little window glass present at the site), and an overall lower diversity of architectural materials present on the site (Figure 5). The placement of these quarters both adjacent to roads and in other cases at the end of ridges closely conforms with the placement of field quarters at other Virginia Piedmont plantations where surveillance was more concerned with monitoring slaves' movements on the landscape rather than with specific activities (Reeves 2003). Initial sampling at these quarters showed these households had an overall lower access to more costly decorated ceramics, furnishings, and personal items (Reeves and Barton 2007).

The third portion of the enslaved community investigated is those structures associated with the stable and craft complex south of the formal boundary of the mansion grounds. Limited excavations carried out in the 1990s produced evidence for a structure with an at-grade floor (based on evidence for ground-laid puncheon floor boards), very little brick suggesting a stick and mud chimney, and low

amounts of window glass suggesting use of shutters rather than glazed windows (Figure 6). All the evidence suggested a log structure very similar to those found at the Field quarter. At the same time, the household goods present were more reminiscent of quarters in the South Yard than the Field quarter.

This structure's close location to the stable (shown on the 1837 insurance plat—see Figure 3) and formal garden suggests this household's association with either an enslaved gardener or stable worker (hence the name Stable quarter). Both of these positions would involve enslaved individuals working closely with members of the Madison household—either through work in the formal garden or with the owners' horses (riding and carriage horses constituted property that represented an investment beyond even that of the human laborers of the estate and as a result the stables were often the more valuable structures on the estate) (Vlach 1987; Wells 1993). Limited testing outside of this one household has revealed a wide array of artifact concentrations and features suggestive of additional household structures on this portion of the plantation landscape.

What this group in the household comparison allows for is the potential for a third control variable to contradict the simplistic comparison between house and field slaves. What makes the Stable quarter so compelling is that its inhabitants potentially held roles on the estate that were somewhat transitional in relation to the roles held by field and house slaves. Such labor roles would not demand the 24-hour-a-day response to the needs of the Madison family under which house slaves were placed, but at the same time make them a "trusted" slave in terms of handling the property held near and dear to the Madison family (either through work in the garden or the stables). Contrasting the patterns seen at both field and house quarters with the Stable quarter will provide an important dimension in establishing the complex interplay between labor roles and material living conditions as well as how these reflect social ties between households, the plantation, and even the region.

Research Design of this Proposal: the Household as a window into the Community

The proposed study centers on the excavation of house structures, yards, and "trash" areas—what has been defined in other studies as the house-yard complex (Agorsah 1999; Armstrong 1990; Edwards 1998; Gundaker 1998; Westmacott 1992; Heath and Bennett 2000). During the research, at least two house yards from each settlement area will be examined through archaeological excavations of the unplowed house yards already discovered from previous surveys. In this, the excavations will involve extensive exposure of yard areas to delineate artifact scatters, evidence for yard furnishings (fences, work poles, hearths, etc), and the visual and physical relationship of these yards to the surrounding areas through the use of plantings (potentially used for both shade and screening) and layout. The use of screenings (built and natural) has been noted as especially important in creating privacy for enslaved inhabitants from the eyes of the white owners and management (Armstrong 1990; McKee 1992) as well

as screening the work yards from the formal areas of the mansion such as the approach along the carriage road of the front lawn (Reeves 2007). These differing functions of screening show how such landscape features were seen very differently by the owner and slave (Isaac 1982; Upton 1988; Reeves 2004) and the impact such visual proximity had on various parts of the enslaved community will be examined in this study. In addition, we will also be recovering evidence for the structures themselves in the form of chimney bases, piers, and other architectural features and objects. Finally, we will be seeking the remains of trash scatters which not only inform the edges of yards, but also provide insight into access to material goods. While the archaeology that has been carried out to date has shown that such features and deposits do survive at all three sites, the sampling has been nowhere nearly sufficient to directly address the issues being approached by this study.

What is key to the analysis of these household remains is placing each set of material patterns in its historic context. The research design is intended to differentiate between actions occurring on a range of scales including how material remains were influenced by one's place in the community, regional restrictions on material goods (such as particular ceramic types not being available within a market region), or individual decision-making ability set at the household level. What organizes the analysis and interpretation of archaeological data is the scale at which these actions take place—whether it be the region (market accessibility), plantation (controls set by the Madison family), community (the loci of slave quarter), or household (the specific house area being examined). These varying scales of analysis are inspired by what William Marquardt refers to as "effective scale" in human actions (1993:107). Marquardt defined effective scale as a measure (both temporal and spatial) through which observed behavior (in this case artifact patterns) can be meaningfully understood. What Marquardt and others assert is that we are more likely to ascertain broader social actions that influenced patterns seen in archaeological assemblages by examining these patterns through a range of spatial and temporal scales (Marquardt 1993:111; McGuire 1992; Reeves 1997 and 2010; Wilke and Farnsworth 1999; Hauser 2009). In this case, the effective scale of analysis is guided by patterns seen between and within the three different loci of the enslaved community being examined in this study—house, field, and specialized artisan. In turn, our comparisons of these three different groups of households seek differences and similarities of material remains that suggest interpretive explanation at varying levels of analysis. These varying levels include individual households (the individual), subgroup within the community (field, house, or stable), plantation (aspects unique to the Montpelier community), and finally region (such as market access or regional traditions). Each of these levels of abstraction is informed by their particular historical context to best interpret causal agency seen in the archaeological record. Causal agency is seen as taking place in everyday actions or "practice" (Beaudry 2004). By approaching patterning of material remains from these defined historic contexts, conclusions can be sought that are informed by the social

actions and decisions set at each level of analysis.

A simplified example of this analysis can be seen in two sets of data obtained from initial investigations of the three discrete groups of Montpelier's enslaved community: ceramics present in trash assemblages and architectural form of housing as revealed through features and architectural deposits. In these preliminary examples, detailed in Appendix D (page 55), we see that the distribution of planter-owned ceramics corresponds to direct interaction between owner and slave (such as occurred between the Madisons and the slaves residing in the South Yard and Stable quarters) while housing type was determined by whether one resided within the confines of the formal landscape of the mansion (such as the South Yard). The example comparisons are preliminary and based on casual observations from our initial excavations at these sites. The proposed project seeks to explore these connections in greater depth and develop the interpretive context for the relations in a richer fashion and among many more sets of data.

While the comparisons discussed above seem like subtle distinctions, it is through these comparisons that a broader context can be built to understand how social relations within the community took place at differing scales of action. These contrasting scales of action allow the confluence of labor hierarchy, place within the spatial proxemics of the plantation landscape, relationship with the owner, and interaction between slave households to be meshed together. In addition, bringing multiple households into the comparison allows tighter patterning to be drawn from these comparative levels of analysis. By bringing such analytical units together within a contextually cohesive methodology, we can begin to reconstruct the rich fabric of social relations, class distinctions, and social action that was present in this community known otherwise only through a sparse set of documentary records[6]. One might argue that to study a community such as Montpelier where there are almost no specific records of household structure, slave's roles within the plantation, and demographic data would make such an analysis much weaker than for a better documented slave community. However, when one considers that most plantations in the American South share the same lack of documentation found at Montpelier, it becomes even more important to develop methodologies and case studies to overcome such obstacles. In effect, this project is an effort to make visible an otherwise invisible community. At the same time, these efforts can help make the little-known role that Madison held as a slave owner visible—an important and worthy goal to

[6] Much of the documentation of the plantation from the retirement years at Montpelier (1817-1836) was destroyed in the 1850s when, following the sale of the property, the papers were transferred to Madison's step-son, John Payne Todd. John Payne Todd was notorious for his numerous scandals and gambling debts that brought the Montpelier estate into considerable debt. When Madison family members discovered the cache of Montpelier papers at Todd's home following his death in 1852, the decision was made to save a few scraps and relegate the rest to the flames. *Fredericksburg News* 1855. President Madison's Notes on Dr. Franklin (also including description of destruction of Madison family papers). 22 November. Fredericksburg, Virginia. Copy on file, Montpelier Archives, Montpelier Station, VA.

build a more complex and nuanced understanding of a gentleman farmer who in his public, political life established the rights of citizenship that all Americans enjoy today. The contradiction, of course, being that for the descendent community born from the slaves he maintained as personal property, it took over 150 years to begin to enjoy the same rights. It was only through the constant struggle of African Americans asserting their humanity that the brutal institutions initiated by plantation slavery were overcome (Wilkins 2002). Ascertaining the forms this struggle took under plantation slavery is the goal of this community-based study. The outcome of this analysis will additionally be compared and contrasted to wide array of contexts—both similar historic contexts of enslaved communities belonging to other Presidential planters (Kelso 1997; Galle 2004; Pogue 2002; Heath 1999; Thomas 1998) and other lesser known planter contexts both in Virginia and the wider Atlantic World (Fesler 2004; Franklin 1997; Wilkie and Farnsworth 1999; Reeves 1997; Armstrong 1990).

History and duration of the project

The proposed research project benefits not only from the direct surveys that allowed for the discovery of the sites that are part of this proposal, but also from the wider study of the mansion grounds by the Montpelier Archaeology Department. This long-term project has involved research staff from the Montpelier Foundation as well as outside scholars, research departments, and individuals. We will first discuss the Montpelier Archaeology Department's research history of the enslaved community.

Montpelier Archaeology Department

Current research on the enslaved community at Montpelier is an outgrowth of eight seasons of previous research into the formal landscape and service complex at Montpelier (2002-2009), assessment of the South Yard in 1992 and 2008, surveys of the Field quarter complex between 2003 and 2005, and earlier surveys of the Stable quarter in the 1990s. The surveys and initial excavations at all of these sites revealed a discrete occupation from the 1810s through to 1844. Dolley Madison sold the property in 1844, and archaeological excavations confirm that following this sale the sites were abandoned with only topsoil accumulating and no major disturbances being present. Removal of this topsoil revealed the intact living surfaces (yard and structure features) of the early 19th century. The most important aspect of these earlier excavations is that structural remains of slave quarters were located in all three slave settlement loci for this project, and that excavations at these locations showed excellent preservation; all sites have unplowed contexts and contain structural remains. The ability to locate structural features is extremely important for the interpretation of surrounding yard features. Without adequate evidence for structural location, great difficulty exists in interpreting surrounding yard contexts, especially with regard to how structures might shield yard activities from view of the main house or overseer's house (see Figure 1). The sites' intact structural remains will facilitate such analyses of visibility. In turn, having yard deposits

set in an unplowed context allows for the recovery of complete yard surfaces and features that would be eradicated in plowed contexts. The previous surveys and Phase II excavations allow the ambitious excavation schedule of this three year project to be met by pinpointing areas to place excavation units.

As explained above, in 2002-2006, we conducted extensive testing around and inside the mansion (Tinkham and Reeves 2008). This work was associated with the restoration of the Montpelier mansion back to its 1820s appearance. During this restoration project, archaeological research was necessary to detail the use and appearance of the cellars during the Madison era and for the yard immediately surrounding the mansion. Funding for the project came from a donation from the Paul Mellon estate. From 2006-2008, we focused our research on re-establishing the appearance of the front grounds including the entrance gate, road and formal fence that defined the curtilage in front of the mansion and to the south (Reeves 2007). These excavations resulted in the restoration of the front grounds of the mansion and allowed us to construct a much broader synthesis and understanding of the Madisons' formal landscape. This research was funded by a grant from the Perry Foundation, private donors, and from the Earthwatch Foundation. The results of these excavations at the mansion have been worked into a manuscript that is under contract for publication with the University Press of Florida. The 2008 season was spent assessing the South Yard of the mansion to locate the full extent of the paling fence and picket fence that defined the southern part of the mansion curtilage, building on information obtained from the initial investigations in the early 1990s. In the process of these explorations, we were able to verify the presence of additional structures shown on the 1837 insurance plat and to confirm the preservation of yard surfaces and domestic deposits in this portion of the site (Marshall 2009; Trickett 2009).

During 2002-2005, survey and excavations in the proposed area for a new visitor center for Montpelier facilitated identification of the Field quarter, including at least four quarters for field slaves, a barn site, and work areas. Funding for this survey came from the budget for the construction of the visitor center. Our excavations and surveys resulted in the visitor center and parking lots being positioned in a previously disturbed area that the duPont family had used for the construction of a swimming pool and tennis court complex in the 1920s. During the 2002-2005 seasons, no mitigation work was needed as the project area was protected from any ground-disturbing activities—leaving these yards intact for future study, such as the project proposed here.

The Stable quarter was located during survey and excavations carried out by National Trust for Historic Preservation archaeologists in the early 1990s. These excavations identified the location of one house area, and shovel test pit surveys identified additional potential house sites as well. Both excavations and shovel test pit survey showed this area to have the same degree of preservation as the South Yard with unplowed contexts containing structural and yard features as well as extensive trash

deposits. A brief shovel test pit survey carried out in the spring of 2009 identified the location for the stable shown on the 1837 insurance map. More intensive testing that will be carried out during the Spring 2010 (prior to the beginning of the proposed research) will focus on defining the areas within this site.

Collaborative Research at Montpelier

The implementation of this study of the enslaved community at Montpelier would not be possible without the long-term collaboration between the Montpelier Archaeology Department and several universities. For the past 22 years, Montpelier has hosted the James Madison University (JMU) archaeological field school (May-June) and for the past seven years has hosted a second archaeological field school with the State University of New York (July). Through these two field schools and our summer intern program an average of 50 students spend over three months engaged in intensive field and laboratory training. The summer program is augmented by independent studies carried out by University of Virginia and JMU students at the Montpelier archaeology laboratory during the spring and fall semesters. In this course, students learn how to record and analyze attributes of various groups of artifacts from sites excavated at Montpelier.

Over the past three years, the success of our active student intern program has been made possible by a staff of professional archaeologists who have broadened the learning experience of students in the field. The presence of a highly trained staff has allowed the field school students to become more involved with the research through direct and applied supervision. This not only provides students with training, but also allows us to open a large number of units through closely supervised labor. In addition, many students continue on as interns throughout the summer and during the semesters assisting with field and laboratory work. With the acquisition of funding for the proposed project, not only will the research endeavor continue this educational and research relationship, but it will benefit from the continuity of a staff experienced in the soils, history, and material remains unique to the Montpelier property. The staff presence at the site is only made possible through acquisition of outside research funds as no funds for intensive field research are available through the Montpelier Foundations budget[7]. These outside funds provide the means to conduct the kind of research projects such as that proposed in this study.

In addition to student programs, for the past 18 years we have conducted a week-long work/study program for adults interested in intensive field training in archaeology. We expanded the adult-experiential education program during the 2006-2008 seasons to include volunteers from the Earthwatch Institute. Since that time, we have expanded these adult week-long experiential programs and now host

[7] The operating budget at Montpelier provides the salary for the Director of Archaeology and one field director. All other positions in the archaeology department are funded through research and mitigation-based projects derived from outside monies. The same situation exists for curatorial and research staff at the museum. In the future, it is hoped that endowments will allow our departments to grow, but for the time being the youth of the Foundation (established in 2000) precludes this opportunity.

nine excavation programs each year. A wide array of individuals have taken part in these programs, most especially teachers who seek extracurricular activities to augment their teaching agendas. These programs have expanded our educational base as well as provided fees that help support staffing of the archaeology program. The proposed research will include these teaching programs as part of the field and laboratory schedule. In addition to these week-long excavation programs, and with the archaeology lab being open to the public seven days per week, we have developed a volunteer program with about a dozen volunteers who weekly assist in washing artifacts, water screening and processing soil samples, and helping to catalogue architectural materials. Similar to the student and week-long programs, these volunteers are closely supervised by Montpelier Archaeology staff and receive training through our manuals and periodic lectures.

Given the focus of this proposed project on the African-American community, we are also seeking a way to involve both the Montpelier Slave Descendent group and the local African-American community in this project. This involvement is especially important in terms of directing research questions into areas that have special meaning for the African-American community. One of the best ways the project director has found to accomplish this is through direct community involvement with the archaeological research process, in which he has successfully engaged with descendent communities over the past two decades (Reeves 2004). Archaeology in and of itself is a community-building experience and the teamwork, when properly structured through trained professionals, brings people together as a working research team. This involvement provides descendents with a working knowledge of what kinds of questions archaeology can answer and also provides them ownership over the research. Given that we already have training programs in which we have successfully initiated public participants into our excavation and lab work, we will extend this opportunity to descendents through a week-long excavation program designed for community involvement. Contacts with the local community can be made through the project director's role as Vice President of the Orange County African-American Historical Society and through our Montpelier slave descendent links. We have well-established contacts with Montpelier slave descendents through the two reunions we have held at Montpelier in 2001, and more recently in 2007[8]. The week-long excavation program will be held for all three seasons (2010, 2011, and 2012) and no fees will be charged to participants (for more information on our excavation programs, see http://montpelier.org/explore/archaeology/excavation_programs.php.)

There are two outcomes of such community involvement. The first is involving the community directly with the research questions so the meaning and range of these questions can be broadened beyond

[8] The 2007 gathering was a joint event between the Montpelier Foundation and the Orange County African-American Historical Society and invited attendees included the local community. John Hope Franklin gave the key note address. The project director was a key organizer of this 2007 event and assisted with the 2001 gathering.

those of the archaeological community. To quote the title of a recent article by the project director, such involvement has often allowed the "right" questions to be asked, which then served as a bridge between the living community and their ancestral remains (Reeves 2004). The second outcome of this collaborative approach is to structure the interpretive program so the community can have a voice in how the Montpelier Foundation presents the enslaved community to the visiting public[9].

The Montpelier Archaeology Department is part of the Montpelier Museum Division and the Division's researchers and curators will be directly involved with the analysis of material goods and landscape features. The Curatorial Department has established a research database (which the archaeological objects are keyed to) that allows the interconnections between documents and material goods to be established. Thus, connections can be made between archaeological objects (both features, sites, and artifacts) and documents (such as merchants books, visitor descriptions, and inventories) that allow a dynamic link between these sets of data. There are plans to publish this database (running under the FileMaker™ platform) on-line and make it available to the public once vetted and established. Staff in the Museum Division include curators and researchers with backgrounds in archaeology and history.

In addition to archaeological field schools, the archaeological research program at Montpelier has been augmented by collaborative research efforts with the Geology Department at James Madison University, the Pollen Lab at Washington State University, and the Zooarchaeology Lab at the University of Arizona. These collaborations, which have provided research projects for graduate students at all three universities, will be utilized for this project as well. As detailed in the methods section, the collaborative research programs, featuring intensive training of students in field, laboratory, and analysis techniques, are key components to our research of the enslaved community at Montpelier.

Staff

The Montpelier Archaeology Department has the combined advantage of having a well-trained staff with professional archaeological experience working at Montpelier or other historic sites for three or more years, and a working collaboration with universities and specialized laboratories for analysis of site finds. The collaborative nature of this research program provides the department with a depth of experience necessary for carrying out the proposed field work and analysis[10]. While the salaries of the Director of Archaeology and one additional staff member are provided by the Montpelier Foundation, it is stressed that the ability to carry out intensive research is dependent upon outside funding.

[9] This scheme of engaged research and involvement with interpretive decisions is modeled after our excavation and interpretive program at the Gilmore Farm, a restored farmstead built by a former slave of James Madison's on the estate at Montpelier (Reeves 2004). The Gilmore Farm is open to the public and is free of charge (http://montpelier.org/explore/community/gilmores.php).

[10] Note, to avoid repetition, names of specialists mentioned in methods section (Mittelman, Raymer, etc.) will not be repeated in this staff and consultant section.

Matthew Reeves has been the Director of Archaeology at Montpelier since 2000. For the NEH project, he will serve as the **Principal Investigator** and participate in daily operations at the site. His main focus will be interpreting site finds, coordinating the long-range field methodology with the field directors of the project, and monitoring field work. Dr. Reeves has directed over a dozen archaeological field schools and is adept at ensuring efficiency of work in the field, budgets (both spending and fund raising), and interpreting the results of excavations. His research interests center on the archaeology of plantation life, African-Americans (both enslaved and free), and the Civil War. His background includes more than 15 years of directing research projects on plantations and freedman period sites in Jamaica, Maryland, and Virginia. He has published several articles and monographs on his research on African-American and Civil War sites and presented numerous conference papers on these subjects. Dr. Reeves received his Ph.D. from Syracuse University in 1997 and prior to his work at Montpelier held positions with the University of Maryland and the National Park Service.

Adam Marshall and **Mark Trickett** are the Field Directors for the Montpelier Archaeology Department. With multiple projects being run throughout the year, having two field directors allows one director to be writing project reports while the other is in the field. During a single field season, each site will be divided into at least two or three project areas, thus allowing discrete units of analysis and write up to be completed by cycling field directors in and out of the field in a timely manner. This setup has allowed us to keep up-to-date on our report writing as well as keep abreast of other archaeological projects that occur on the property. The field directors' responsibilities entail coordinating daily aspects of field work including field supplies, proper recording of site information, and coordinating daily work schedules. Adam and Mark have directed all the archaeological field schools and programs since the 2005 SUNY Potsdam field school at Montpelier. Adam has over ten years of supervisory experience on sites in Kenya, Wisconsin, North Carolina, and Virginia. Adam received an M.A. degree in Anthropology from East Carolina University in 1999. Mark has worked on projects in England, Ireland, Italy, and Borneo and completed his doctorate in Archaeology from Durham University in England in 2008 (while working full time at Montpelier).

Kimberly Trickett has been the laboratory manager for the Montpelier Archaeology Department since 2007. Kim received a B.A. degree in Anthropology from James Madison University. **Christine Heacock** has served as a lab research assistant at Montpelier since 2008. She graduated from the College of Charleston in 2007 and is currently enrolled in the M.A. program at the College of William and Mary. Both Kim and Christine have headed up the object analysis of ceramics, glasswares, and other objects recovered from the mansion excavations (see methodology section for more details and Appendix E, page 60, for examples).

Steve Currie (B.A. SUNY Potsdam), Hope Smith (B.S. Mary Washington University), and

Stefan Woehlke (B.S. George Mason University) are archaeological technicians for the Montpelier Archaeology Department and have worked at Montpelier since 2007. All have served as site supervisors for the numerous field schools held at Montpelier and have an ingrained understanding of the field recordation and methodology used at Montpelier. In addition, with the wide range of projects they have been exposed to (both at Montpelier and at other sites) they have a working knowledge of interpreting site features and strata and are relied upon for making independent decisions on a daily basis. In all ways, members of the archaeology staff are self-directed, enabling them to supervise students on an independent basis—thereby effectively combining decision making and field training for daily site operations. Each member holds a specialized role within the department including: processing and organizing digital photos from the field, digitizing field drawings into AutoCad™, and field photography.

The Montpelier Museum Division includes **Lynne Hastings** (Vice President of Museum Operations) who previously held the position of the head curator at Colonial Williamsburg and at Hampton National Historic Site; **Tom Chapman** (Research Coordinator) whose specialty is research on the Madison Family and in the past served as Field Director for the Montpelier Archaeology Department; **Grant Quertermous** (Curatorial Researcher) whose specialty is material furnishings and past roles include Archaeologist at Ash Lawn Highland.

Lynne Lewis (Senior Archaeologist, National Trust for Historic Preservation) has been conducting research at Montpelier for the past twenty-four years and during National Trust management of Montpelier (1985-2000) served a major role in the research design and planning of archaeological projects. She will assist in the archaeological field schools as an instructor, provide consulting services on previous research carried out on the property, and provide oversight for the National Trust for Historic Preservation for management of archaeological resources.

Dr. Cullen Sherwood is a professor of soils geology at James Madison University and will provide laboratory analysis of soils and field expertise in the identification of soil formation processes in the field. Dr. Sherwood has over 30 years experience in analyzing soils of the Virginia Piedmont and is a leading expert in the field of soils geology.

Dr. John Jones is a professor of palynology and archaeology in the Department of Anthropology at Washington State University. Pollen recovered from the project will be extracted and analyzed at Dr. Jones' lab at Washington State University. Dr. Jones has worked with the Montpelier Archaeology program for the past three years.

Leslie Raymer is a paleobotanist with New South Associates. She has decades of experience in identifying floral remains from Piedmont Virginia sites and specializes in interpreting floral remains from plantation contexts. She will be responsible for identifying seed remains and identification of charred wood species recovered during the project. She will involve Montpelier's university interns in this

process through workshops held at the Montpelier Archaeology Lab in July of each season. She will train students how to identify seeds from charred wood samples.

Dr. Barnet Pavao-Zuckerman is a curator of zooarchaeology (Arizona State Museum) and a professor of Anthropology (School of Anthropology) at the University of Arizona. Faunal remains recovered during this project will be analyzed at the Stanley J. Olsen Laboratory of Zooarchaeology in the Arizona State Museum. Dr. Pavao-Zuckerman has worked with the Montpelier Archaeology program for the past seven years.

Methods

During the 2010-2012 field seasons, the excavation techniques employed will be informed by10 years of continual archaeological excavations led by the current Director of Archaeology, Matthew Reeves. The survey techniques and sampling strategies employed have been honed over this time period and used to successfully locate and excavate the ephemeral features characterizing enslaved homes of the 18th and 19th centuries. As such, the methodologies discussed in this section will be applied at all three loci of excavations. Basic field methodology used by the Archaeology Department is summarized in a guide provided to all staff, students, and volunteers (see Marshall 2009).

Locating and Assessing Features

Previous shovel test pit surveys and secondary testing with excavation units have already been conducted at all three sites and have resulted in the identification of quarter sites and confirmed the location of intact, undisturbed, early 19th-century stratigraphy. Additional remote sensing work will be conducted at each site to assess intra-site location of anomalies and potential features of interest. All of the sites being considered for excavation share the same soil type, the Davidson clay loam, an iron-rich clay derived from decomposing greenstone (meta-basalt). These clay soils have proven to create high impedance to electromagnetic signals used in remote sensing, making it almost impossible to locate any features other than those containing hard surfaces such as stone paths, chimney footers, and paved surfaces. In the testing of various areas of the Montpelier grounds, we found that soil resistivity provided a far more accurate match with the archaeological footprint of stone features than Ground Penetrating Radar, EM surveys, and proton magnetometers. Resistivity meters work by sending an electrical signal into the ground and then measuring the resistance that the ground provides to this current. A Montpelier volunteer, Lou Mittelman (retired electrical engineer specializing in remote sensing) has designed and built a resistivity meter and will provide the project with the necessary equipment and technical expertise for running and interpreting the data from this device. In his testing at Montpelier, Lou has successfully located stone paths that connect the South Yard with the mansion, stone chimney bases (South Yard), pavements for the front road at the mansion, and stone-lined cellars at the original Madison family complex.

Aside from the 1837 insurance plat, documentary research carried out at Montpelier over the past thirty years has revealed very little in regard to the location or configuration of slave quarters at the site (see footnote 6,

page 11). We will be coordinating with the Montpelier Museum Division as they assess the documentary record for references to crop production, transcribe several local merchant books for references to slave transactions, and provide background information on books Madison might have owned in relation to landscape planning—most especially reference to worker cottages. The Museum Division is also working with David Mattern at the Madison Family papers project (University of Virginia) to catalogue any reference to Madison household furnishings, landscape elements, and slave references during the retirement years.

Excavation of Archaeological yard areas at quarters

Archaeological excavations at the three loci have already shown the presence of intact structural features, yard surfaces, and domestic deposits. We will place excavation units across house-yard areas to completely expose the house in relationship to surrounding yards. All features and deposits will be excavated and sampled using a variety of strategies designed to extract the maximum amount of information from the archaeological record. Given the long history of continuous excavation at Montpelier, we are at an advantage to carry out this process as we have developed excavation techniques and sampling strategies designed to take advantage of the unique geological and cultural features of the landscapes utilized by the enslaved community.

All soil deposits and features will be excavated using stratigraphic excavation methods. During excavation, there are a myriad of samples that will be taken ranging from soil chemistry, phytolith, pollen, and water screen samples (for both small finds recovery, grit analysis, and floral remains). See *Analysis of Finds* for discussion of these sampling techniques. For recording features, we use a combination of field drawings and photogrammetry[11] to develop computer assisted drawings (CAD) of features encountered at the site. In addition, we record all living surfaces with a total station so that landscape can be reconstructed in a 3-D environment (for examples of these reconstructions see Figures 4 and 7). In this process, we are working in collaboration with the University of Virginia's Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities to bring all of this information into an interactive web environment (see *Dissemination of Results*).

During our training programs (for both students and adults) the archaeology staff works to train participants and manage the excavation process. We have a series of field, stratigraphy, and laboratory manuals developed to train students and reinforce concepts learned in the field (Appendix E, page 58). During excavation, the field director is responsible for the creation of a "site strata" chart which records the stratigraphy at the site in a single matrix as it is encountered. This site strata matrix allows strata between excavation units to be related and allows for the testing of field hypotheses during write up based on analysis of samples and finds recovered from the site (for examples of site strata reporting, see the Appendix E, page 58, for sample reports).

[11] Photogrammetry is the processing of a photograph of a feature (such as a brick walk) to render it into a scaled orthographic image that can have coordinates assigned to the image and tie it into a site plane map. This allows point provenience data to be obtained from any point on the map and drawings to be easily created from tracing the photograph in a CAD program.

Analysis of Finds

Once samples are recovered from the field, there are a number of analytical procedures that take place at the Montpelier Archaeology Lab and at specialized labs where samples are sent. The Montpelier Archaeology Lab is used for the processing and conservation of all artifacts. All artifacts recovered are integrated into our master study collection (which contains all unique examples of artifacts recovered) during cataloguing and analysis. Cataloguing of artifacts will include both weight and fragment-size analysis of all bone, ceramic, and glass artifacts. In previous studies, we have found fragment-size analysis to be critical in the analysis of yard deposits where artifact size tends to be smaller due to foot traffic (Reeves 1997). All ceramics and glasswares will have a vessel analysis executed whereby the minimum number of vessels present will be assessed in addition to cross-mend analysis. Cross-mend analysis has been used at several slave sites at Montpelier to develop a sophisticated understanding of relationships between features, trash deposits, and yard scatters (Reeves and Fogle 2008 and Fogle 2008). Vessel analysis will also include set analysis whereby each vessel will be matched into the overall collective decorative sets we have developed for refined-white earthenwares for the entire Montpelier property. We have already developed a master type-set for late 18^{th-} and early 19th-century ceramics encountered at Montpelier. These have been assembled from the trash deposits excavated from President Madison's parents' household, the household of the Madisons during their retirement years, and from early 19th-century trash deposits excavated around the 18th-century South Kitchen of the South Yard (Reeves and Rich 2009; Trickett and Heacock 2009; Heacock 2009). This set analysis allows not only an understanding of the diversity of decorative types between households, but also highlights matching sets that occur between households. The discovery of matching sets between households is incredibly important for understanding slaves' acquisition of ceramics from the main house sets, the potential for distribution of certain ceramics by the Madisons as part of estate-wide provisions, regional patterns of access to ceramics by enslaved households, and trading that might have occurred between households[12].

Water-screen samples are also processed at the lab including flotation and separation of samples into gradient sizes (see laboratory manual and discussion of cobble and pebble analysis below). Water-screen sampling not only allows for the recovery of small finds missed through conventional ¼" screening techniques (such items as egg shell, fish bone, straight pins, beads, etc), but also provides data about differentiation of human-introduced gravels for the creation of yard surfaces. We have found that measuring the proportion of gravels (rock and brick material greater than ¼" in size) to soil provides an excellent indicator for cultural yard surfaces or graveled yards. This technique was first developed during the excavations carried out at the Field quarter site and allowed us to define the extent of gravel yards at the site, even at work sites where artifact distributions and size plots did not allow such differentiation (Reeves 2008). Excavations in the South Yard and

[12] A similar analysis technique was employed by Laurie Wilkie and Paul Farnsworth in their analysis of slip-decorated ceramics from Clifton Plantation in the Bahamas (2005).

at the mansion grounds have demonstrated ways that this analytical technique allows for the differentiation between grass-based topsoil and eroded yard surfaces. Likewise, this technique will be critical for defining the extent of yards found at the three loci being examined. Not only will yard deposit samples[13] be water-screened, but all feature and hearth ash deposits will be water-screened for recovery of small finds and charred floral material.

The analysis of floral and faunal material provides another element of our collaborative research. Studies at African-American sites across the Atlantic World have shown the importance of documenting the relative presence of wild and domesticated faunal and floral remains (Armstrong 1990; Crader 1990; McKee 1987; Thomas 1998; Wilke and Farnsworth 2005). The floral data comes from two sources: 1) burnt seeds found during flotation of soil samples from excavations, and 2) collection of soil samples from which fossil pollen and phytoliths are extracted. Flotation is a process of disaggregating, drying, and submerging a soil sample into a drum of water, and collecting the charred organic material that floats to the surface (Appendix E—lab manual and research papers (Reeves 2007), page 58 and 60). Charred materials recovered from the flotation process are then identified using microscopes with the goal of recovering any seeds (wild, cultivated, or ornamental) from the charred sample. The seed samples are then sent to the New South Laboratory in Georgia for identification of species. Our consultant paleobotanist, Leslie Raymer, has found that such floral identification is integral in understanding African Americans' diet and use of medicinals (Raymer 2000). From her work, Leslie will be able to set her finds into her wider knowledge of African-American botanical use across the American South. All faunal materials will be sent to University of Arizona's Zooarchaeology Lab for analysis under the direction of Barnet Pavao-Zuckerman. Previous studies of Montpelier household faunal remains reveal that examination of the species of animals consumed, the availability of preferred cuts of meat, the ratio of wild game to domesticated livestock, and the age at death of food animals, reveal patterns in differential access to resources at the plantation (Pavao-Zuckerman 2004, 2005).

A more exacting procedure for floral identification involves the recovery of fossil pollen from sealed deposits (such as those found below sealed clay deposits in features and under deposits capped by rubble deposits). John Jones (WSU) has found that in sealed deposits such as those provided by the clays at Montpelier, pollen grains are incredibly well preserved. Pollen profiles provide an excellent basis for understanding the surrounding vegetation, exposure of deposits to the surface, and comparison to known pollen cores taken around the mansion in previous studies (Jones 2004). Understanding the vegetation that was present in the quarters is of paramount importance to this research. Comparisons of tree versus grass pollens has the potential to provide information on the surrounding landscape and the presence of ornamental and fruit trees in the yards of slaves.

[13] Within each excavation unit, at least one 3-gallon soil sample is taken from each unique stratum being excavated. Details for the sampling technique and methods can be found in the Field Methods Guide (*http://montpelier.org/explore/archaeology/reports/field_methods_guide.pdf*).

Phytolith analysis will also be conducted to establish the presence of vegetal material in features uncovered. Phytoliths can provide information on leaves that drifted into pits (providing potential indication of trees in yards), identification of species from root features, and general presence of organic debris in feature deposits.

Soil chemistry has proven to be invaluable in the interpretation of activity areas for all yardscapes of the 18th and 19th century, but most especially for slave quarters (Heath and Bennett 2000). Soil analysis will be conducted by Donald Storer of Southern State Community College who has conducted analysis of soils from contexts at Mount Vernon, as well as from many other sites. When combined with distributions of artifacts and gravels, soil chemistry distribution studies can provide major insights into deposition of organics not recoverable from the surviving artifactual evidence (Fesler 2004; Heath and Bennett 2000).

Architectural material (brick, mortar, plaster, and nails) is one set of material culture encountered in all excavations at the Montpelier mansion. During excavations, all brick and mortar larger than ½" are saving and any rocks larger than 2.5" are also saved. When these materials are brought back to the lab, they are waterscreened, catalogued, and then sampled. The rationale for the through analysis of architectural materials is both for deciphering yard surfaces, but also tapping into the collective knowledge of our architectural experts from the mansion restoration. Through consulting with Ray Canetti and Wayne Mays (historic masons involved in the architectural restoration at the mansion) and Mark Wenger (the lead historic architect for the mansion investigation) we have been able to assign mortar, brick, and plaster to specific mansion building campaigns (1760, 1797, and 1808) based on attributes of color, inclusions, sand tempering, and fabric (see Figure 7). In contexts where there is an absence of dateable artifacts (such as ceramics) these architectural materials have provided invaluable clues for assessing temporal contexts for deposits and features. During the course of the quarter investigations, these experts will continue to be consulted about architectural materials encountered in the deposits. In addition, we have found that consulting with these architecture and mason historians has been invaluable in the interpretation of architectural remains. Their decades of experience in examining both surviving architecture and archaeological remains makes them a walking encyclopedia of architectural knowledge.

Final Product and Dissemination

The most prominent vehicle for disseminating the results of this project is through academic texts and articles. Several articles that will cover the individual sites being examined during the course of this project are planned. These would be first presented as conference papers, then disseminated through journal articles (such as the *International Journal of Historical Archaeology, Historical Archaeology,* and *African Diaspora Archaeology Newsletter*). The final analysis of material from a cross-community comparison will allow for the creation of an article on the utility of scalar and household analysis on plantation communities. Such an article would serve as an excellent comparison to other articles discussing scale as an analysis technique (Hauser 2009 Reeves 2010; Wilkie and Farnsworth 1999). Finally, the manuscript resulting from this project would focus on the community approach to the

archaeology of slave life and build a framework detailing how varying scales of analysis between plantation, community, and household allow for substantive analysis of the households being examined. Such a manuscript would offer an excellent comparison with Wilkie and Farnsworth's study, *Sampling Many Pots* and other manuscripts on the archaeology of African-American communities across the Atlantic World. In addition, current research being carried out at other homes such as Monticello offer tremendous potential for comparison and contrast in such a volume. The current project the Monticello Department of Archaeology is conducting, digitizing all of Mulberry Row into the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery (DAACS) would make available such comparative data. While it is not within the scope of this project to enter the information derived from these excavations into DAACS, it is the ultimate goal once analysis is complete, as the next phase of this project.

Technical reports produced by the Montpelier Archaeology Department will be made available to the public through our website in the form of downloadable reports (Appendix E, page 58). In devising our current technical report on the 2002-2008 excavations at the mansion (Tinkham and Reeves 2008; Reeves 2007; Trickett 2009; Marshall 2009), we are writing these reports to be disseminated at two levels. The first is a condensed interpretive synopsis that presents a historical summary of our findings, designed to be read by the lay public and interpretive staff. The second section is an expanded discussion that includes the detail of the archaeological context and is designed to be used by archaeologists for comparative purposes, understanding of method and technique, and for technical recordation for preservation of site information. Both versions will be made available through downloadable .pdf files on the internet. The reporting of our 2010-2013 investigations on the enslaved community at Montpelier will follow a similar format. In addition, the data from this study will be incorporated into the 3-D models for the estate that have been developed through our relationship with the University of Virginia's Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities. These models will be available on the web. An outgrowth of this project will also be the eventual incorporation of the data into the Digital Archive of Comparative Slavery. Such incorporation would occur following the completion of excavation, artifact analysis, and report write-up.

One of the most important parts of the dissemination of the research from this project is the overall context of Montpelier as the home of James Madison, 4th president of the United States and framer of the Constitution. The importance of this "great man" context lies not in the importance of the man himself, but in how the lives acted out at Montpelier reflect or contradict the views he is so well known for, especially in regards to slavery and his vision for a working plantation. The importance of this contrast is that Montpelier is a case study where the ideals of the owner are well established through his writings—most especially on slavery. The findings from this study have the potential to bring to light not only the hidden lives of the enslaved community of Montpelier, but also the hidden life of James

Madison—most especially with regard to how he practiced slavery on his plantation and family home—a subject that is not well documented. In this study we have at our disposal the contrast between how Madison presented slavery to the multitudes of national and international elite that he and Dolley Madison hosted at Montpelier, to those lives of enslaved workers who were either incorporated into the formal landscape (South Yard), screened from the mansion grounds (Stable quarter), and distanced from the mansion complex (Field quarter). The potential this historic context holds is two-fold. The first is the potential this study has to refocus our understanding of who Mr. Madison was in his private life as a slave owner. This information has the potential to provide valuable insights not just to archaeologists, but also to scholars of presidential history--those who study the factious origins of the United States' experiment in freedom. The second potential this historic context holds is for the general public. There is a large segment of the population whose interest in past presidents drives them to learn about American founders through books, articles, the internet, and, of course, through visiting presidential homes. In the case of Montpelier, almost 100,000 visitors per year take advantage of this opportunity.

Conducting archaeology on a property visited by close to a 100,000 visitors each year provides a rare opportunity for disseminating the history of plantation life to the lay public. We have already integrated the restored mansion into the surrounding landscape through the restoration and interpretation of the front lawn. The second part of this process is to re-establish the enslaved community as part of the built and visible landscape. This project will provide the interpretive basis for such physical interpretation of the enslaved community. One of the more integral parts of this interpretive program will be the involvement of an invested descendent community whose voice will be reflected in our research design and interpretive themes. Their involvement holds the potential to have our interpretation of the enslaved past at Montpelier resonate with present-day generations of African Americans who visit Montpelier. Our ultimate goal is to make the living spaces of the enslaved community apparent to this visiting public through highly visible ghosted structures and integrating the yards into the surrounding landscape. It is only when these households literally emerge from the ground that their presence will once again be felt at Montpelier.

Work Plan

During all phases of the project, staff of the Montpelier Archaeology Department will be involved in supervising daily field and laboratory research carried out by students and interns from James Madison University, State University of New York, or Expedition volunteers. In general, each project year will follow the same routine. During the warmer months of the year, we will be in the field excavating sites and in the lab washing and processing all field samples. Resistivity surveys will be carried out during the early spring as this is the time of the year the soil retains the most moisture—a must for effective resistivity readings. All field work will be overseen by the Project Director (Reeves) with direct

supervision being carried out by field directors (Trickett and Marshall). Each field director will be assigned a specific area within each site (each of the three sites will be divided into specific sub-areas)—as the excavation of each area is completed, Trickett and Marshall will change roles, with one being in the field and the other writing up the results of the area just completed. This will allow the write up to occur immediately following the excavation of each project area section. During the colder months of the year all staff will be busy in the lab cataloguing artifacts and architectural material, analyzing finds, digitizing maps, and assisting in report completion. Kim Trickett will oversee the analysis of artifacts in the lab with field crew and interns performing the cataloguing of finds. For report writing, this process begins in the field with recording of site strata and final analysis is completed during the winter months. At the beginning of each Fall semester, the grit and gravel samples will be sent to the JMU Soils Laboratory, pollen and phytolith samples will be sent to Washington State University, macrobotanical remains will be sent to New South Associates, and faunal remains will be sent to the Arizona State Museum's Zooarchaeology Laboratory. The schedule is as follows:

July 2010-February 2011—Given that most of the South Yard has already been surveyed through resistivity, we will begin excavations here—focusing on the house-yard area of the northwest duplex and the intervening area towards the northeast duplex. During the 2008 season, the eastern yard of the duplex was excavated and revealed that much of the activity areas were to the east—in the yard between the NE and NW duplexes. Finds will be analyzed and samples will be processed.

March –October 2011—We will undertake resistivity survey of Stable quarter complex—excavation of yard and house area (known) and investigate additional domestic quarters revealed through earlier STP surveys and results from resistivity survey.

November 2011-February 2012—We will conduct analysis of finds from the Stable quarter.

March-October 2012—We will undertake resistivity survey of Field quarter.We will combine the results of this resistivity survey with earlier excavations carried out during the 2002-2005 surveys. These surveys revealed at least two structures within the portion of the site that contained evidence for multiple occupations. Combined results will provide us with the areas to be excavated during the 2012 season.

November 2012-March 2013—We will conduct analysis of finds from Field quarter.

April-June 2014—We will undertake comparative analysis of finds from all three sites, final report write-up, and development of overarching material analysis. Comparisons from vessel data between the three sites will be finalized. While the final analysis is being completed, comparisons of site information (architectural features, yard features and deposits, and household artifact assemblages) will be compared to the regional and broader Atlantic World studies made available through DAACS as well as from consulting with other project researchers.