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We define Maroons by their overt resistance; theirs was one of the most extreme forms of anti-slavery resistance in the Americas and for many scholars is representative of the human desire to be free. However, by defining Maroons by the act of marronage, we isolate them from every other person of color fighting to maintain autonomy in the colonial Americas. This paper undertakes a comparative analysis of three Florida sites, a slave cabin at Bulow Plantation in east-central Florida, an urban slave site at 71 Park Place in St. Augustine, and the Maroon settlement of Peliklikaha in central Florida, all of which date from the late Second Spanish Period and early Territorial Period. A comparison of Maroon and slave societies is built through the dual frameworks of resistance and ethnogenesis, with the purpose of placing Maroons within a regional context and making them part of the spectrum of African and African American life in the colonial world, rather than a discrete entity. Ultimately, we find that the material culture of Maroons and their enslaved peers was very similar, and that opportunity played a significant role in shaping African American cultural transformations in the 19th century. The archaeological evidence also challenges our understanding of resistance at each site, and emphasizes the need for a complex approach to resistance in the study of the African Diaspora.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

During the colonial era, Spanish Florida built a reputation as a refuge for self-liberated people escaping from slavery in the Carolinas and Georgia. The peninsula’s impenetrable swamps and sloughs, and the competition of colonial powers within the region, created an opportunity for runaways to establish themselves as free people once again, becoming Maroons. The Maroon narrative is representative of the “wrenching collision and entanglement of the Old World with the New” (Peterson and Brown 2001:3-4) that began with the arrival of Europeans to the Caribbean in the 15th century. Many Americans now recognize the process of cultural devastation initiated by that landing, and the radical racial inequality that accompanied it. However, as many scholars have recently noted, that process was not wholly destructive (Bateman 1990; Mulroy 1993; Peterson and Brown 2001). In fact, “the very processes responsible for the decimation of many cultural groups of the Americas led to ethnogenesis, the birth of new ones” (Bateman 1990:1). Florida Maroon society was born out of the European competition over the Southeastern United States and the Caribbean, the rise of the Seminole nation and their movement south into the newly vacant Florida peninsula, and the actions and agency of the Africans and African Americans who sought their freedom there (Mulroy 1993).

We define Maroons by their overt resistance, but our study of their lives should not be so narrowly constrained. Within the spectrum of anti-slavery resistance in the Americas, theirs was one of the most extreme forms and we think of Maroons as the ultimate outsiders, rejecting colonial life altogether. Even the name “Maroon,” from the Spanish cimarrón meaning escaped or feral cattle, is a reference to how, whom, and what Maroons resisted. However, by defining Maroons by the act of marronage, we isolate them from every other person of color fighting to maintain autonomy in the colonial Americas. In addition, the study of Maroon history reveals
that marronage was a complex process, not a static status. The study of Maroons should not be narrowly focused; we cannot analyze a Maroon site solely on the quality of “being Maroon.”

The purpose of this paper is to undertake a comparative analysis, placing Maroons within a regional context, as part of the spectrum of African and African American life in the colonial world, rather than as a discrete entity. While a macro-regional study would have the advantage of a wide array of literature, from regions with more well developed Maroon archaeologies, and historians have produced useful Pan-American comparisons (Price 1979), we risk essentializing the Maroon experience by looking for a unique Maroon material signature. Conversely, a regionally specific study, keeping in mind local historical context, complicates our understanding of Maroon life, as well as the lives of Black Floridians in general. Rather than assuming that marronage created an impenetrable boundary between slaves and freemen, or that by escaping slavery Maroons entered some sort of social and cultural limbo, this paper attempts to build a more integrated understanding of Maroon and slave societies.

This paper consists of a comparative analysis of three Florida sites—a slave cabin at Bulow Plantation in east-central Florida, an urban slave site at 71 Park Place in St. Augustine, and the Maroon settlement of Peliklikaha in central Florida, all of which date from the late Second Spanish Period and early Territorial Period—and utilizes the dual frameworks of resistance and ethnogenesis in order to challenge and re-evaluate to the roles of Maroons and enslaved peoples within Florida history and the African Diaspora more generally. Three primary questions will be addressed: (1) What are the basic material differences and similarities between the various sites under investigation and what can these comparisons tell us about daily life at each site? This basic analysis will also set the stage for a more critical comparison of the sites. (2) Are historically recognized patterns of resistance visible in the material record and how do
they differ between sites? Within academic study, Maroons have been characterized by their active resistance to colonial society (Weik 1997), however, it is generally accepted that most enslaved peoples practiced some form of resistance (Franklin and Schweninger 1999; Mullin 1994; Rivers 2000). By looking at resistance across the sites we can begin to understand Maroons within the range of resistance practiced by enslaved Africans and African Americans rather than as outliers. Finally, (3) to what extent is ethnogenesis evident at each of the sites, and what form does it take? Archaeologists have difficulty getting at ethnicity and identity through the material record; however, a comparative approach allows us to study people of similar background in varying settings in order to better understand their cultural adaptations and creations.

This paper adheres to an outline as follows. Chapter 2 provides a theoretical context for the comparative analysis, placing this work within the greater field of African Diaspora archaeology, as well as addressing it’s antecedents in Maroon archaeology. In addition, Chapter 2 will address the applicability of the concepts of resistance and ethnogenesis to the study of Maroon lives. In Chapter 3, relevant regional history will be reviewed, addressing the history of the African presence in Florida up to Statehood and the constant political and cultural change that occurred in Florida in the colonial period. The methodological approach is presented in Chapter 4, including an explanation of the organization of the analysis and basic excavation data from each of the three sites. In Chapter 5, the three sites are analyzed, looking first at architecture and space, then ceramics, faunal and floral material, and finally personal items. Chapter 6 consists of a summary of results and a discussion about what each site, its material assemblage, and the comparison of the three sites, can tell archaeologists about daily life for Africans and African Americans in 19th century Florida, the practice of resistance at each of
these sites, and the cultural transformations occurring at that time. The discussion focuses on the role played by opportunity in the cultural transformations occurring at each site and the ways that the three sites complicate our understanding of resistance. Chapter 7 concludes by making a number of recommendations for future study and addressing the significance of comparative archaeology in Florida.

Figure 1-1. Study sites.
African Diaspora Archaeology

African Diaspora archaeology consists of “the study of material culture to describe and interpret the diverse experiences of African Americans and the social processes that affected their lives” (Singleton and Bograd 1995:1). The field has followed a consistent trajectory from simple identification and description of African life on plantations, to more nuanced understandings of African American identity and culture, and the responsibilities of archaeologists to engage African American descendant communities and a diverse public (Agbe-Davies 2007; Ferguson 1992; Orser 1990; Singleton 1990). As an archaeological study of African and African American lives, and the role of resistance and cultural transformation in those lives, this study is firmly located within the field of African Diaspora archaeology. In this chapter, I review the history of African Diaspora archaeology, in particular the study of race and ethnicity, and then addresses the themes of ethnogenesis and resistance. Although Diaspora archaeology includes work within the Americas, the Caribbean, and even Africa, the discussion here is primarily limited to the continental United States.

Development of the Field

In the early 20th century, historical archaeology in the United States was focused primarily on Euro-American sites. Archaeology was the first step in reconstructing places of Euro-American historical importance, like Jamestown and Colonial Williamsburg, and the homes of political leaders, like Mount Vernon (Heath 2012; Singleton 1990:70). In the Southern states, plantations and their white owners were the focus of archaeological and historical storytelling. However, this myopic focus ignored people of color and perpetuated romantic
views of slavery and the colonial treatment of Native Americans (Calhoun 1992:1; Orser 1990:121; Sanford 1999:4-5).

The very first excavation of an African-American site happened by chance in 1943. The archaeologists, Adelaide and Ripley Bullen, had little historic information about the site later nicknamed “Black Lucy’s Garden,” and it is unclear why the Bullens even chose to excavate there. Their report (Bullen and Bullen 1945) is primarily descriptive rather than analytical in nature, however, it constitutes the first ever archaeological study of a black household in the United States. Similarly, John Griffin’s (1950) survey of Prospect Bluff on the Apalachicola River could be considered early “accidental” African Diaspora archaeology as Griffin was aware of the fort’s presence and significance to Maroon history, but neglected to analyze or interpret his findings. Griffin was primarily concerned with the later U.S. military presence at the nearby Fort Gadsden.

In the 1960s, archaeology as a whole underwent dramatic change as the culture-history approach was traded for scientific processual methods and theory, and new cultural resource management laws simultaneously grew and professionalized the field. Still, historical archaeology was slow to be affected by theoretical and professional changes. It was however, influenced by the Civil Rights Movement (Little 2007:107; Wilkins 2013), and although academia remained focused on plantations and sites of national significance, attention shifted away from the plantations owners and their mansions to the homes and lives of enslaved Africans and African-Americans at those same sites (Agbe-Davies 2007; Ferguson 1992:xxxvi; Orser 1990:121; Singleton 1990:72; Heath 2012). However, as historical archaeology had not yet fully adopted the processual, “New Archaeology,” the first African Diaspora studies were largely focused on architecture and description, much like the earlier focus on reconstruction.
Charles Fairbanks undertook the first true archaeological study of African-American life in 1968 at Kingsley Plantation in Duval County, Florida. While Fairbanks and others had conducted historical archaeology in the region since the 1950s and even excavated at sites related to African and African-American experience since the 1960s (Boyd et al. 1951; Davidson et al. 2015; Fairbanks 1983:22-23; Orser 1984:2; Poe 1963), his work at Kingsley was the first full-scale project directly targeting slave life. At Kingsley, Fairbanks was interested in uncovering holdovers or “Africanisms” within slave life. Melville Herskovitz (1941) coined the term “Africanisms” to refer to remnants of African identity and cultural practice in the Americas. This concept was based on a theory of cultural continuity within the African Diaspora, rather than complete cultural erasure or “catastrophism.” Herskovitz imagined that slaves, “heroically remember[ed] and preserv[ed] their ancient ancestral culture” (Matory 2005:43) and Fairbanks imagined that those memories manifested in material culture. Ultimately, Fairbanks failed to identify an African signature at Kingsley, but later excavations at the site would eventually produce a number of artifacts that have been linked to syncretic African religious practices and spiritual beliefs (Davidson 2012, 2013, 2015).

In the 1970s, Fairbanks’ seminal work at Kingsley was followed by a variety of archaeological investigations of African and African American life in the (mostly Southern) United States. Many of these studies were functional in nature (Howard 2013:38) and still sought to identify a unique African or African-American material signature. For example, James Deetz (1996[1977]) attempted to define the differences between African American and Euro-American architecture at Parting Ways in Virginia; Vernon Baker (1980) analyzed the materials excavated by the Bullens at the Lucy Foster site decades earlier, looking for an Afro-American signature; and Leland Ferguson (1980) reanalyzed “colono” ware, the pottery commonly
attributed to Native American groups, suggesting instead that the form and decoration of the ceramics alluded to African cultural influence. It is significant to note that while some excavation on free black sites did occur, early Diaspora Archaeology focused primarily on plantation sites.

It has been suggested that these scholars limited themselves to identification and function due to what they perceived as methodological and theoretical limitations on their work (Orser 1994:33). Hawkes’s hierarchy, or ladder of inference, suggests that archaeological inquiry can explain processes that create sites and materials with the greatest ease, that it is slightly more difficult to get at subsistence economics, even more difficult to discern social and political institutions, and that religious and spiritual institutions are practically impossible to identify or understand through the archaeological record. Early African Diasporists may have been limited by the perceived theoretical limits of their field. However, they were also limited by their practice of culture-history archaeology. Historical archaeology itself did not emerge in the United States until the 1960s and 70s, and the individuals practicing early African Diaspora archaeology, or plantation archaeology, were trained in prehistoric archaeology. At the time, prehistoric archaeologists operated on the assumption that culture was unchanging and that by identifying material changes over time, archaeologists could map the rise and fall of cultures. True to their training, early plantation archaeologists treated culture as a static entity and took the positivistic view that culture or ethnicity was inherent in the material residues of life.

Theresa Singleton (1999) referred to this period of research, born in the activism of the civil rights movement, focused on a residual African ethnicity, and primarily descriptive in nature, as “moral mission archaeology.” According to Singleton:

Moral mission archaeology sought to interpret the everyday lives on African Americans from their own perspectives using the remains of housing, foodways,
and personal effects recovered from excavations. It succeeded in giving a voice to the voiceless, but many of the interpretations were overly simplistic… Further, by choosing African survival rather than its demise or reconfiguration as a research focus, moral mission archaeology established a research precedent that still stalks African-American archaeology today: the search for cultural markers linked to Africa as the most significant aspect of African-American material life (Singleton 1999:2).

Although many early studies were limited in this way, historical archaeologists gradually adopted a more analytical approach and many shifted their focus from ethnic markers to the issues of status and class in the plantation setting. John Otto (1975, 1980, 1984), through his analysis of ceramics on various plantation sites, pioneered a class-based model for the study of cultural and socioeconomic difference. This approach was utilized and refined by others including Sue Mullins Moore (1985), who conducted a comparative study of social and economic status at various Georgia plantations; including slave, overseer, and planter contexts; Charles Orser who also undertook a study of status (1988), but broadened the conversation to include economic power, arguing that concepts such as status and caste were too vague for plantation studies; and Theresa Singleton (1980), whose dissertation at the University of Florida had the goal of establishing a pattern for comparison within and between plantation sites. The class-based studies of the late 1970s and 1980s established patterns still used in site comparisons today (Otto 1980, South 1977). However, they also produced a set of overly simplistic conclusions about plantation life, different than the earlier cultural marker studies, but no less limited. These studies, although focused on class rather than ethnic identity were still limited by their search for a specifically African American “pattern” in the material record (Armstrong 1985; Singleton 1980; Wheaton et al. 1983).

Contemporary Practice

While African Diaspora archaeology has not abandoned the study of plantations, ethnicity, or socioeconomics, it has expanded in a variety of directions in the last twenty-five
years. The field has widened in types of sites and time periods studied, as well as in theoretical approach. Archaeologists have lengthened their time frame to include late nineteenth and early twentieth century tenancy, such as Kenneth Brown’s (1994) study of slave and tenant contexts on Levi Jordan plantation. They have widened their range of interest beyond plantations to include towns, such as Davidson and Tennant’s (2008) discussion of the racial violence at Rosewood, Florida; and cities, such as Paul Mullins (2001) analysis of African-American’s role in consumer society. Significantly, these articles do not just expand the range of sites investigated, but also the social issues. Brown, Davidson and Tennant, and Mullins all deal with significant aspects of African-American life in the antebellum period and recognize the persistence of social injustice within American society.

Increasingly, African Diasporists have attempted to complicate our understandings of the past and have utilized a variety of sources to do so. Linda Stine’s (1990) study of agrarian life in rural North Carolina utilizes both anecdotal evidence and archaeological data. Burial data provides a degree of individualism not available in most contexts (Davidson 2004, 2010, 2012), despite often being a point of controversy and debate for developers, archaeologists, and community members (LaRocche and Blakey 1997, McCarthy 1996). A number of archaeologists studying religion and spirituality, as well as a few studying architecture, tobacco use, and African made ceramics, have turned to historical and ethnographic comparisons in West Africa (Davidson 2015; DeCorse 1999; Posnansky 1999). African and African-American religion and spirituality, studied both on the plantation and off, has also gained significant interest in the last quarter decade. Although some studies have echoed the less critical “ethnic marker” studies of the past (Stine et al. 1996), several scholars have used religion as a means to study phenomenon such as resistance and empowerment (Wilkie 1995) and ethnogenesis (Young 1996).
The 1990s also introduced an era of critical reflexivity within African Diaspora archaeology as it became clear that the study of economics and status, so common in the 1970s and 1980s, was not producing meaningful research. In particular, Parker Potter’s (1991) scathing critique of William Adams and Sarah Boling’s (1989) study of class status and buying power amongst slaves, made the case that archaeologists must take ownership of their social responsibilities. Potter argued that Adams and Boling’s article, and its focus on buying power and access to particular ceramic types, was inappropriate considering the reality of slavery, as well as damaging to the descendents of slaves who inherited centuries of suffering. In the context of a plantation, “slavery is a more significant social fact … than the possession of pearlware or porcelain” (Potter 1991:99) and furthermore, ceramic sherds should not be made to stand for the person who used them. Potter asserted that “social responsibility means having a full awareness of the contexts and the consequences of the work one does, the conclusion one reaches, and the modes of expression one chooses” (Potter 1991:95).

Potter was not alone in his demand for a more critical African Diaspora archaeology. In 2000, Paul Farnsworth contended that the field had a history of glossing over violence, despite its focus on plantation contexts. Four years later, Kerri Barile (2004) and J.W. Joseph (2004) analyzed the national historic register and CRM fields, respectively, finding that African-American sites were not receiving adequate documentation or analysis compared to Euro-American sites. Additionally, the late 1990s and early 2000s saw an increased interest among archaeologists in the issues of remembrance and the rights of descendent communities and the public. In a more theoretical piece, Gregory Streich (2002) questioned not only whether, but how we should remember painful historical legacies, and the differing responsibilities of individuals, communities, and governments. In 1996, John McCarthy published “Who Owns
These Bones,” contrasting his experiences at two black cemeteries and suggesting that there is a right way to engage a community and a wrong way (McCarthy 1996). In 1997, Carol McDavid, working at the Levi Jordan Plantation in Texas, discussed the potential for “inclusive” practices that give community members and descendant communities alike the opportunity to participate in site interpretation (McDavid 1997); and Cheryl LaRoche and Michael Blakey (1997), working at the New York African Burial Ground, highlighted the ability of an interested public to correct injustices in the interpretation and excavation of historical sites. More recently, Terrance Epperson (2004) evaluated McCarthy, McDavid, LaRoche and Blakey’s writings and projects, in a paper that reflects the growing reflexivity of archaeological practice.

Race and Ethnicity

Ethnicity has remained a critical feature of African Diaspora archaeology since its inception. Nonetheless, we have witnessed a shift over time in how archaeologists approach ethnic identity and African cultural influence in the Diaspora. One significant shift in archaeological thinking about ethnicity relates to interpretations of cultural interaction (Singleton 1999:4). As noted above, the earliest archaeological studies of African American life focused on a search for what Herskovitz termed “Africanisms” on plantations. Herskovitz’s writing on these survivals and the process of acculturation, or “those phenomena [cultural traits or complexes] which results when groups of individuals having different culture come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups” (Herskovits 1941:10), shaped the study of ethnicity for many years. Both the earliest descriptive studies and many class-focused works understood ethnicity in a static way and although Herskovitz recognized the multi-directional nature of culture change, archaeologists were really only applying this theory in a single direction (Howson 1990). Acculturation, as commonly
applied, implied the loss of African culture and assimilation within Euro-American culture, and was heavily dependent on the positivistic concept that culture is inherent in the material world (Otto 1975, 1984; Wheaton et al. 1983; Wheaton and Garrow 1985).

The concept of acculturation is applied in Wheaton and Garrow’s (1985) study of both architecture and artifact patterns on the Yaughan and Curriboo plantations, in coastal South Carolina, as well as the work of Wheaton, Garrow, and Friedlander (1983) on colonoware from the same region. These scholars concluded that the material record of an African-American slave site is intrinsically different from the material record of a Euro-American site of the same period. Additionally, they argue that, over time, whether through greater contact with Euro-Americans or by pressure from the plantation overseer or planter, the African American site became more like the white model, as material goods reflected changes in the slaves’ culture. By identifying the African use of “white” architectural modes and European ceramics, the authors believed that they had identified the replacement of African traditions with European ones.

Application of the acculturation model was dependent on a positivistic understanding of culture change and ethnicity, and the assumption that culture is inherent in the material world (Upton 1996). Wheaton, Garrow, and Friedlander produce a static and normative understanding of culture, similar to, and springing from, the culture history tradition of early American archaeology.

More recently, the acculturation model has been dismissed for newer models of cultural interaction, like creolization, power, and domination. This change was the product of dissatisfaction with the acculturation model (Singleton 1995:5), the need for frameworks capable of dealing with “multidimensional changes in multiethnic social environments” (Lightfoot 1995:206), and an increased recognition of the diversity of slaves’ African origins (Posnansky
Many archaeologists recognized that human relations cannot be reduced to a set of status variables or ethnic markers (Howson 1990:90), and adopted theories better able to account for the complexity of cultural interactions. Creolization studies have examined culture change not as a shift from one set of beliefs to another, but as the mixing of cultural influences (Ferguson 1992, 1999; Howson 1990; Mouer 1993, 1999; Orser 1992; Paynter 1992) while studies of power and domination have attempted to deal with the unevenness of colonial power relations (Babson 1990; Epperson 1999; McKee 1999). These ventures have placed increased focus on Africans and African Americans as active participants in colonial society, including studies exploring how subaltern peoples appropriated dominant material culture and gave it new meaning (Singleton 1999:5).

Another relatively recent development in historical archaeology is the study of race. Although John Otto (1980) used the term ‘race’ in his study of status on antebellum plantations, he was essentially referring to ethnicity, and the two are often conflated in archaeological literature (Singleton 1999:2). Anthropology as a discipline has a regretful history when it comes to race. The framework of social Darwinism was central to the emergent field of anthropology, and early anthropologists functioned on the premise that a distinct hierarchy of races existed. Eventually, these ideas were recognized as the product of racism and ethnocentrism (Boas 1945), and anthropologists discarded the concept of race in favor of a more palatable alternative: ethnicity. Unfortunately, anthropologists had failed to disentangle ethnicity from race before adopting the term. Coupled with the inherent positivism of culture-history this flattening enabled the search for “ethnic markers” (Orser 1999) and the obfuscation of racism by historical archaeologists. By reifying ethnic identity, archaeologists denied the role played by racist beliefs...
in defining identity, especially in relations of power (Babson 1990) and missed an opportunity to make their studies more relevant to the public (Orser 1999).

In the past twenty-five years, however, there have been a number of suggestions by African Diasporists about how we can begin to get at race. Some have looked to deconstruct the traditional conflation of race and ethnicity (Orser 1999, Patten 1997), and have instead advocated the study of racism (Babson 1990). Terrance Epperson (2004:36), in “Critical Race Theory and the Archaeology of the African Diaspora,” argued for an archaeology that practiced in the “valorization of the African-American culture of resistance and the denaturalization of essentialist racist categories” and Maria Franklin (1997) has asserted the need to include black voices and ideas in the archaeology of black lives. These archaeologists are part of the wider movement to define purpose in historical archaeology, and emphasize the role of power in both the historical setting and the present day.

Meanwhile, rather than dealing specifically with race, some scholars have begun to tackle the complexity of social identity as a whole (Voss 2015, Weik 2009, Weisman 2007). According to ethnographer Ronald Cohen (1978:388), “the same person can be categorized according to different criteria of relevance in different situations,” a reality readily observed in the study of colonialism and the Atlantic world. Therefore, a holistic approach to culture, race, and ethnicity makes the most sense for scholars attempting to study identities “not easily dissected into the etic (or Anglo-American emic) categories of race, class, or ethnicity” (Dawdy 2000:107). Although creolization addresses the mixture of cultural influences, it fails to explain why certain fusions occur (Perry and Paynter 1999) and does not adequately incorporate issues of power, whether social or economic. At Venable Lane in Charlottesville Virginia (Patten 1997), the Presidio San Francisco (Voss 2015), Fort Mosé (Deagan and Landers 1999), and countless other sites across
the Americas, the categorization of identity is problematic (Patten 1997). For this reason, as pointed out by Deagan (1998), many scholars are looking beyond racial and ethnic categories and instead considering the process by which identity is formed: ethnogenesis.

**Ethnogenesis**

Anthropologists have increasingly turned to the concept of ethnogenesis in order to address culture, race, and ethnicity as components of greater social identity. William Sturtevant (1971) introduced the concept of ethnogenesis to American anthropology with his study of the sociopolitical processes by which the Seminole separated from the Muscogee (1971:92) and defined ethnogenesis as the establishment of group distinctiveness. Since Sturtevant’s study the concept has been used a great deal within anthropology and now historical archaeologists have begun regularly applying the concept in their work (Voss 2015). Within historical archaeology, ethnogenesis is used to refer to the emergence and articulation of a shared identity, and although no two studies apply the term in exactly the same way, a few common elements are recognized.

First, ethnogenesis requires people. It depends on interaction and the creation of shared values and meanings, requiring frequent and predictable communication (Weisman 2007:202). Ethnogenesis does not occur within an isolated context, however; no culture is an island. Affected both from without and within, ethnogenesis is “a cultural process in which sets of people create a new, shared group identity, distinct from other self-defined groups” (Weisman 2007:198; see also Hill 1996:1,2; Moore 1993; Whitten 1996:194). Ethnogenesis involves how you define yourself in relation to others, but also how others define you (Mullins 1999, Voss 2015) and the result is a “synthesis of imposed and adopted characteristics that is forged through contact and conflict” (Upton 1996:4).
Second, ethnogenesis is a continuous process. It is commonly accepted among contemporary anthropologists that culture is fluid and ever changing (Moore 1993:13) and, consequently, that sociocultural systems and identities are malleable (Bilby 1996:119). People can produce cultural change more rapidly at times and more slowly at others (Horning 1999:132), however, culture is never static. Ethnic groups are “fluid entities in [constant] interaction with other groups, their allies, neutrals, or antagonists” (Babson 1990:21) and ethnic, racial, cultural, and social identities of human communities are changed over time by those interactions (Moore 1987). Ethnogenesis is a continual process in which “older ethnic categories and boundaries are redefined” or assigned new meaning or value (Bilby 1996:119).

Third, ethnogenesis is tied to historical consciousness and conflict. Involving people both internal and external to the social group in question, ethnogenesis is a public, historical process (Whitten 1996). This cultural and political dialogue over identity informs the particulars of cultural production and reproduction (Tsing 1994:283) and involves the conscious participation of the individuals involved. Ethnogenesis is not just a “synthesis of a people’s cultural and political struggles to exist,” it is also “their historical consciousness of these struggles” (Hill 1996:2; see also Hill 1988).

This is not to suggest that ethnogenesis is always a deliberate act, however. Gary Anderson, in his study of ethnogenesis within the Oglala nation, argues that people reinvent culture to fit their needs (Anderson 1999). While Anderson’s underlying assertion of human agency is valid, culture is influenced by tradition, existing structures of thought and practice, and does not require “conscious concentration” (Bourdieu 1984:170). Individuals may consciously maintain or introduce cultural components, as in the negotiation of the terms of culture contact by Indians and Europeans on Hispaniola so many centuries ago (Deagan 1998:24) or the push by
indigenous communities in Chiapas, Mexico to establish native-language schooling for children, however, this level of consciousness is not necessary for cultural change to occur and actors are not always aware of the grand cultural and social implications of their actions.

Ethnogenesis, as compared to older models of culture change such as acculturation, focuses on the people involved and the means of cultural transformation, rather than defining beginning or end points. It enables us to accommodate a discussion about social identities that embraces “change as well as stability, permeability as well as boundedness, fluidity as well as fixity, and social agency as well as social structure” (Voss 2015:12). Essentially, ethnogenesis enables more complicated understandings of the past through archaeology. When we accept that culture involves living, breathing people, and is constantly changing, material culture is uncoupled from ethnicity and race, or any other static categorization (Upton 1996:4).

Transformation and Cenogenic Societies

As noted above, ethnogenesis is a particularly useful concept when studying the social and cultural implications of the European colonization of the Atlantic world. Countless cultural groups across the New World “owe their existence to the major upheavals and displacements of persons associated with European conquest and expansion during the last five centuries (Bilby 1996:120). Cultural articulation and assertion in the Americas post-1492, was “a creative adaptation to a general history of violent changes—including demographic collapse, forced relocations, enslavement, ethnic soldiering, ethnocide, and genocide” (Hill 1996:1) and resulted in unique and unprecedented cultural (and biological) blends (Bilby 1996).

Two terms are used to describe the unique communities that emerged from this large-scale cultural collision: neoteric and cenogenic societies. Nancie Solien González (1983:4) describes neoteric groups as:
a type of society which, springing from the ashes of warfare, forced migration or other calamity, survived by patching together bits and pieces from its cultural heritage while at the same time borrowing and inventing freely and rapidly in order to cope with new, completely different circumstances.

She suggests that neoteric communities are essentially created by the circumstances to which they adapt and welcome rapid change in order to survive and prosper (Solien González 1983).

Kenneth Bilby’s concept of cenogenic societies is similar. Bilby (1988:1) defines cenogenic societies as:

born of conditions associated with the major transformations wrought by the worldwide expansion of capitalism – the large scale uprooting of peoples through wars, conquest and colonization, slavery, migration, and the forced removal of people from their ancestral lands. Most of them emerged from frontier settings. The resulting sociocultural “fusions” were truly new creations, owing much to the past, but without precedent at the same time.

Bilby (1988:15) takes issue with Gonzalez’s idea that these societies lack roots and argues, “the special kind of abrupt ethnogenesis involved in the creation of these societies does not preclude the transmission of a great deal of cultural knowledge from the past” (Bilby 1988:15). For him, the defining characteristic of these societies is the importance of history and historical consciousness in the development of their self-definition and identity (Bilby 1988). Bilby’s concept is more useful for understanding ethnogenesis as a kind of cultural transformation, rooted in the past but producing novel cultural responses to the problems of the Atlantic world.

**Resistance**

Not all instances of ethnogenesis are related to resistance, or even power. However, as ethnogenesis arises from human communication and interaction, and human interaction does not often take place on a level social playing field, it is unsurprising that a number of social identities have been influenced by resistance, or even defined by it. Almost forty years ago, in the introduction to his book *Maroon Societies*, Richard Price (1979:2) approvingly noted that historians had begun actively deconstructing the image of the docile slave. Within archaeology,
however, functional analysis of material culture and the concept of acculturation inhibited the study of resistance. Archaeologists were focused on elite-dominated power relationships (Howard 2013:38). Although archaeology was slower to pick up the study of resistance than ethnographers and historians (Weik 1997:84), today the subject is a major subfield within American archaeology, and is of primary interest to Diasporists and Marxists (Orser 1996, Paynter and McGuire 1991, Weik 1997) who study both overt forms of resistance (Agorbah 1994; Orser 1994,1996) and covert (Ferguson 1991; Hall 1992; McKee 1992; Singleton 1995).

Resistance and the assumption of its significance in the lives of Africans and African Americans across the Western Hemisphere, is the premise of the study of marronage, however, it is admittedly easy to read resistance in the analysis of Maroon sites (Orser 1996). Without a discussion of the range of experiences and manifestations of resistance we risk oversimplifying the phenomenon.

In early studies of slave rebellion and marronage, resistance is commonly understood as the product of the simple desire to be free. In his book *Testing the Chains*, Michael Craton (1982:27) suggests that “for some Africans, resistance may have been a natural and conditioned response to the shame of being enslaved; for others, a reaction triggered by shock; and for others again, delayed and subtle response to a gradual appreciation of the extent of change and the possibilities inherent in the situation.” More recently, however, it has been recognized that slaves resistance was not necessarily inherent, nor was it simply the product of shock or the realization of the realities of slave life. Slaves practiced resistance in order to maintain family ties, to express dissatisfaction, to take advantage of opportunities, to gain control over their economic and social lives, and yes, sometimes merely to be free (Franklin and Schweninger 1999).
The anthropological study of resistance, both within the African Diaspora and within other populations and contexts, draws heavily on Marxist ideas of class struggle. James C. Scott, (1985:32-33) in his seminal work on resistance, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, defines resistance as actions by subordinate classes “intended to mitigate or deny claims made by superordinate classes or advance claims vis-à-vis those superordinate classes.” Scott looks at everyday resistance and ideological struggle in a Malaysian agricultural village, and its inhabitants’ efforts to resist economic and ritual marginalization. He argues that resistance is typically related to the “material nexus of class struggle,” including the appropriation of land, labor, taxes, and rents (Scott 1985:32-33) by a “coercive and hegemonic state apparatus” (Scott 1985:29). Scott’s influential work has produced the popular understanding that resistance can be defined as “action in opposition to structure” (Sassaman 2001:219).

Nonetheless, resistance is not simply a binary to domination or oppression (Liebmann and Murphy 2010, Scott 1985, Voss 2015), or accommodation (Deagan 2010). Power is a relation (Foucault 1995), and domination and resistance are part of a dialectical relationship. Furthermore, resistance is contextual. Not only is it contextual in that it varies from place to place and is “greatly influenced by the existing forms of labor control and by beliefs about the probability and severity of retaliation” (Scott 1985:34); the very nature of resistance is contextual. Resistance in itself is not identifiable, it is a rationale, a state of mind (Hodder 2004:32) and as we know from the countless records of slave “theft” or worker idleness, what one person defines as resistance can be classified by someone else as an entirely different entity (Liebmann and Murphy 2010:5). Because resistance is a way of thinking, we find resistance “within any contrary practice where knowledge exists of the alternatives” (Pauketat 2001:13).
Resistance has defined the cultural practices of a variety of groups across time and space. As Ken Sassaman (2001:219) notes, “capitalism is hardly necessary to spawn structures of domination or its resistant consequences” and resistance can be identified in countless contexts, both historical and contemporary, within the Americas and without. Sassaman (2001) points to modern Rom and Amish groups as contemporary expressions of resistance and to the Morrow Mountain and Mill Branch cultural traditions as evidence of resistance in the past, arguing that their geographic dispersion, generalized modes of subsistence and ethos of sharing are the results of marginalization, encapsulation, and domination. Looking back to Scott’s study, it is clear that modern Malaysian peasants practice resistance by “foot dragging, dissimulation, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so forth” (Scott 1985:29). Twentieth century hobos and rail-riders practiced resistance through the rejection of employment expectations and the Capitalist Mode of Production (Daniel Sayers, personal communication, 2016) and twenty-first century neo-nazi youth with swastika tattoos resist the dominant cultural narrative of civility (Deagan 2010).

Within the Atlantic world and the tradition of colonialism alone there is a spectrum of resistance and an array of practitioners. Resistance to European control of the Atlantic and the Americas began early and included indigenous peoples, enslaved and free Africans, Euro-Americans, and mixed race peoples (Deagan 2010). Within the varied political and commercial systems of Africa, “native rulers and traders generally and quite successfully resisted European takeover” (Craton 1982:23) and the “West Indian slave inherited and melded traditions of resistance both from the Amerindians, whom they largely replaced, and from their own African forebears” (Craton 1982:13). Resistance continued on the mainland. When Pedro Menendez de Aviles established St. Augustine in 1565 he found that “the allure of escape into the peninsula’s
vast wilderness and slaves’ desire for freedom over any form of harsh or mild servitude” made slavery difficult to maintain (Rivers 2000:3). The Spanish settlers at St. Augustine experienced chronic labor shortages throughout the formative years of the settlement. Fifty of the slaves Menendez brought to the fort absconded within the first few years of their arrival (Rivers 2000).

African resistance in the Americas took both covert and overt forms, from idling and food theft to rebellion and marronage (Franklin and Schweninger 1999). Indigenous Americans, free blacks, and even Europeans resisted the colonial structure by conducting illicit trade, forming anti-colonial alliances, practicing alternative religions, maintaining non-European customs, speaking African and indigenous American languages, and actively subverting the system of slavery (Orser 1996).

Significantly, resistance to colonialism and its long-term effects have continued into the present day. Twentieth century factory workers practiced established means of covert resistance; “there has never been a time in the history of the world when unwilling workers were classed as efficient; and every man who feels that he is ill paid for his labor is an unwilling worker” (Andrews 1978:369). In the mid-90s in Chiapas, Mexico, indigenous groups militarized in an effort to counter globalization, regain indigenous autonomy and control of local resources. For African Americans, resistance may be the single greatest cultural influence carried from slave life to free life. Oppression and domination did not end when blacks removed themselves from slavery, nor did it end with the legal termination of slavery in the Western Hemisphere. Resistance likely maintained an important place within African American culture because there was still something to resist. Even today, Black Lives Matter activists must publicly assert the right of Black Americans to safety and the full enjoyment of their civil rights.
An Archaeology of Thought

Although we typically discuss resistance in terms of actions—destruction of property, armed rebellion, etc.—the archaeology of resistance is an archaeology of thought (Liebmann and Murphy 2010:6). Archaeologists do not study resistance directly; instead, they study the imposition of domination (Howson 1990:88) or racism (Babson 1990:24) and the reaction to that imposition, but domination, racism, and resistance often fail to leave an obvious material signature (Singleton 1998:179). Within African Diaspora archaeology, excavation rarely produces shackles or whips (Farnsworth 2000), instead, resistance is implied from historical records. Archaeologists are often interpreting everyday items in their studies of resistance and the use or social significance of those artifacts cannot be assumed, however, it can be suggested through the use of historical interpretations. As noted above, archaeologists are the ones defining resistance. However, archaeologists must be careful “not to assign social meaning to material remains without taking into account the ambiguous contexts which produced that meaning” (Howson 1990:85). In the study of resistance, much like ethnicity or race, meaning is generally negotiable and “material things are susceptible to various or contested meanings through contexts of action” (Howson 1990:90).

Despite the ambiguity involved in an archaeology of thought, a number of archaeologists have produced studies of resistance. Michael Nassaney and Marjorie Abel (1993) conducted excavations at the John Russell Cutlery Company in Turner Falls, Massachusetts and identified worker resistance to the new system of wage labor. They highlight spoiled knives and imperfectly manufactured parts as evidence of sabotage on the part of workers. Teresa Moyer and Paul Shackel (2008), in their work at the Harpers Ferry brewery in Virginia, similarly noted more than 1,000 refillable beer bottles dropped down the elevator shaft and more usable bottles
stashed behind a wall. Although the possibility remains that these bottles had some sort of imperfection or were the product of accidental waste, within the analytical frame of resistance they are interpreted as the material residue of worker dissatisfaction. While they cannot be definitively confirmed as the residue of the actions taken by a subordinate class, “intended to mitigate or deny claims made by [a] superordinate class” (Scott 1985:32-33), it is one possibility.

Even at sites where overt resistance occurred, it is impossible to point to specific artifacts as markers of that resistance. Randy McGuire’s (2014) study of the Ludlow Massacre Site, a significant space within the Colorado Coal Field War of 1913-1914 and a site of remembrance for modern unionized industrial workers, is couched in resistance. From documentary records, archaeologists know that the site, a strike camp where twenty individuals were killed by the Colorado National Guard and the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company in April, 1914, consisted of resistance simply because it existed. However, material signatures of that existence, from canning jars and metal tins to tent stakes and clothing buttons, cannot be identified simply as archaeological evidence of resistance. The canning jars, for example, are also representative of changing American foodways and food technologies, of a mother’s ingenuity and thrift, and of the recent emergence of mass-produced consumer goods.

There are a handful of archaeological studies of resistance that do not depend on historical documentation. They include Sassaman’s (2001) analysis of Morrow Mountain and Mill Branch peoples, noted above, and Kathleen Deagan’s (2004) research at the site of En Bas Saline in Haiti. According to Deagan, Taínos at En Bas Saline did not regularly incorporate Spanish items into their material life, and when they did, it was typically only food material. She argues that a similar pattern can be seen at Florida mission sites, where the majority of European artifacts recovered are clearly associated European areas of the sites. While these sites were
occupied within the historical period, they lack specific documentation of resistance, and Deagan’s interpretation of resistance is based on the assumption that resistance existed across all colonial sites. This assumption is a commonly accepted one, however, there is still a possibility that the archaeological record reflects Taíno indifference to European material goods, or even exclusion from the European market, we cannot be sure.

**Context for this Paper**

Since the excavation of Lucy Foster’s home in 1943, African Diaspora Archaeology has followed certain internal trends, but has ultimately transformed from a search for an African-American material signature to a more reflexive, socially conscious practice. Archaeologists have begun to recognize their responsibilities as scholars and as writers of African-American history. They have complicated what was once a simple search for African identity. Over time positivism and the search for ethnic markers are being replaced by studies of creolization and racism. White washed practices and interpretations are being replaced by public engagement, and increased communication with black Americans and descendent communities. Plantations are still studied, but so are free black sites. Although Diaspora archaeology in the United States is still overwhelmingly white and middle class, it has made strides to correct that bias and Maroon archaeology has a significant role to play in the future development of the field.

**Maroon Archaeology**

Maroon archaeology emerged in the 1980s, at the same time that African Diaspora studies took firm hold within historical archaeology. Charles Orser and Pedro Funari (2001) suggest that two major influences drove the development of the sub-field: research by historians and anthropologists on the history and social nature of slave revolts, and the realization on the part of archaeologists that contemporary civil rights movements were part of a long tradition of
resistance (2001:62). Archaeologists were already shifting away from traditional plantation archaeology and the new consideration of resistance and power led some to refocus on Maroon sites (Howard 2013:39).

The English term ‘Maroon’ is derived from the Spanish *cimarrón*, which refers to feral or escaped cattle (Arrom and García Arévalo 1986:15-17; Price 1979:1-2). Today ‘Maroon’ is used to refer to a self-emancipated individual who escaped from slavery, and proceeded to live outside of traditional colonial society (Price 1979:1-2; Weik 1997:81), and ‘marronage’ refers to the process of self-emancipating and establishing a life as a Maroon. Maroons are alternatively known as *palenques* in much of South America, *Garifuna* in Central America, *palenques* or *mambises* in Cuba, *Bushinengues* in Suriname and Guiana, *marron* or *mawon* in Haiti, and Maroon communities are known as *quilombos*, *magotes*, and *mocambos* in Brazil. Marronage occurred wherever slavery did, and for a variety of reasons. Maroons ran away “to avoid forced labor, or heal from the wounds inflicted by abusive overseers, to find food, to visit family members such as spouses or relatives on other plantations, or to interact with friends or potential mates” (Weik 1997:82). They also ran away in order to more freely practice their religions and other cultural expressions (Reis 1993) and sometimes marronage was the result of an impulse to simply be free. Significantly, when archaeologists and historians refer to Maroons or marronage, they are specifically referencing individuals practicing *grand marronage*, those who removed themselves from the system of slavery permanently. *Petit marronage* refers to a shorter, purposefully impermanent removal, ranging from hours to months and is not typically included in the study of Maroon society (Price 1979:3).

The work of American anthropologist and historian Richard Price has played a central role in the archaeology of Maroon sites. Price’s (1979[1973]) book *Maroon Societies: Rebel*
Slave Communities in the Americas, the first comparative study of Maroon life, confronted the popular image of runaway slaves as rudderless or without history. Price recognized that Maroons drew on their cultural and historical consciousness in order to build successful communities and maintain their independence. Price also outlines what he identifies as the defining characteristics of Maroon society, noting Maroons’ remote settlements in inhospitable environments, military nature and expertise in guerilla warfare, adaptation to local environments, interaction with Native Americans, leaders skilled at understanding whites, internal dynamism, and inability to disengage fully from the enemy (Mulroy 1993:291, Price 1979).

With these guidelines, archaeologists have undertaken research at Maroon sites across the Western Hemisphere; however, Maroon archaeology is still in its infancy. So far, archaeologists have been primarily focused on site identification and patterning; locating new sites, expanding research areas, determining site boundaries and features, and identifying settlement patterns (Agorsah 1993; Arrom and García Arévalo 1986; Fairbanks 1984; Joseph 1989; Singleton 1991; Weik 1997:83); and many archaeologists have billed their work as simply historical supplement (Arrom and García Arévalo 1986; Deagan and MacMahon 1995; Nichols 1988). Nevertheless, Maroon archaeology has the potential to serve as a testing ground for many of the key questions of African Diaspora archaeology (Weik 1997:84) and can help the field continue its move away from a focus on the master/slave relationship (Orser 1991:51) to a more balanced look at black lives outside of Africa. Maroon projects have taken place in Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Cuba, Suriname, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia (Agorsah 1994; Arrom and García Arévalo 1986; Baram 2012; Deagan and MacMahon 1995; Guimarães 1990; Herron 1994; Marron 1989; Nichols 1988; Orser 1992; Sayers 2014; Weik 2002) and sites for future
research have already been identified in Haiti, Mexico, the Bahamas, Honduras, Sierra Leone, Nova Scotia, Texas, and Oklahoma (Campbell 1993; Howard 2013; Weik 2012).

While Maroon archaeology has a great deal of potential, it also has a unique set of challenges (Baram 2008; Weik 1997; Orser 1998). The very nature of Maroon life means that Maroon sites are ephemeral and difficult to locate. As Price (1979) outlined, Maroons had to continuously defend themselves, and their settlements were strategically hard to reach, located in wetlands, dense tropical forests, or steep mountainous areas (White 2011). Consequently, few historical records can tell us much about Maroon settlements, and sites are not only difficult to locate, they are difficult to survey and excavate (Orser 1999; White 2011). Additionally, between the need for frequent movement and somewhat limited access to trade, Maroons did not amass large amounts of material things, meaning that even when sites are located, artifacts can be few and far between. Archaeologist Cheryl White (2011) argues that Maroon projects have also failed to move forward because of theoretical roadblocks. Maroon archaeology needed a more inclusive ideology than simply rebellion and resistance (White 2011) and it wasn’t until scholars began to look at cultural transformation, initiated by the work of Kofi Agorsah (1993, 1994; Agorsah and DeCorse 1995) in Jamaica, that the field truly found its footing.

Florida Maroon Archaeology

Maroon archaeology in Florida began, as noted above, almost accidentally, with John Griffin’s (1950) survey of Prospect Bluff on the Apalachicola River. Prospect Bluff, or “the Negro Fort”, was built by the British in 1814 about ten miles north of Apalachicola Bay on the Apalachicola River with the purpose of recruiting and training Maroons and Native Americans during the War of 1812. The fort became a locus for Maroon settlement and several hundred Maroons and their families built homes and began cultivating land in the surrounding area.
However, with increasing pressure from the U.S military, the British pulled out of the region in 1815, leaving the fort to a small force of Maroon and Redstick soldiers of mixed training. The fort was considered a threat by neighboring white settlers and was destroyed by U.S. forces in 1816. The land soon became the site of the new U.S. controlled Fort Gadsden (Millet 2013). In 1950, Griffin first visited the site and identified an “irregular mound of sand” east of Gadsden as the Negro Fort (Griffin 1950:257). Griffin recovered European porcelain and earthenware, lead balls, iron nails, and brushed pottery from the mound and later trenching revealed evidence of the site’s destruction including bent barrel hoops from exploded powder barrels (Poe 1963:8-10). More recently, archaeologists have digitally reconstructed the fort (Ed Tennant, personal communication 2016), however, more extensive, planned excavation has never been attempted at the site.

The next site to attract archaeological investigation was the free black settlement and fort north of St. Augustine; Gracia Real de Santa Teresa de Mose, better known as Fort Mose. In 1860, the U.S. Geological Survey recorded the site, and the St. Augustine Historical Society placed a commemorative marker at the site in the early 20th century (Deagan and Landers 1999). Although there was some confusion in the late 1960s as to whether the earlier designations were accurate, a two-day field school at the site in 1971, conducted by Charles Fairbanks of the University of Florida, confirmed that the site had been correctly identified (Deagan and Landers 1999). In 1976, Kathleen Deagan, also of the University of Florida, led a field school that recovered ceramics, lead shot, bottle glass, pipe stems, nails, beads, and buttons at Mose and delimited the boundaries of the site. Over one-hundred subsurface tests were conducted by Deagan’s team (Deagan and Landers 1999:262, 272). In 1986, a bill in the Florida legislature allotted funding for the comprehensive historical and scientific study of the site. Deagan,
historian Jane Landers, and archaeologist John Marron, undertook the project. Their work focused on the fort as the site of the first free-black settlement in the United States, a fact that had been ignored in favor of a military interpretation of the site until the 1970s (Deagan and Landers 1999: 262). Although Deagan and Landers caution that the “archaeological evidence for the Mosé occupation is extremely ephemeral,” (Deagan and Landers 1999:270) their research resulted in several noteworthy insights. Faunal analysis suggests a diet “dominated by locally available estuarine fish and shellfish… [as well as] heavy dependence on wild foods similar to that of local Native American groups” (Baram 2012), and although the material assemblage at the site is different than what has been recovered from St. Augustine in general, it lacks any distinctively African items (Deagan and Landers 1999:273). Research at Fort Mosé inspired a traveling exhibit that launched in 1991 (Deagan and Landers 1999:263) and more recently, a permanent museum was established at the site.

While both of Florida’s Maroon forts have received at least some degree of academic attention, few of the region’s smaller town and village sites have even been located and only one has been the focus of archaeological research. These sites are more difficult to identify than the forts and have even more limited material records. Nonetheless, some efforts have been made to locate, catalog, and sample the Maroon town sites. Several Maroon sites were identified in the Seminole Heritage Survey conducted by South Florida archaeologist Bob Carr and historian Bill Steele in 1993 (Carr and Steele 1993). The purpose of the survey was to create “a database for all types of sites associated with Seminole and proto-Seminole history in Florida” (Carr and Steele 1993:2-3). The close affiliation of Maroons and Seminole societies guaranteed the inclusion of multiple Maroon sites in the review. Although the work itself is incomplete as a database of Maroon sites, at the time it was assembled, it was the first inclusive list of Seminole
sites in Florida. The survey consisted of aerial photograph interpretation, extensive archival research (only twenty-three sites were newly recorded), and site walk-overs. The project also included the evaluation of several land grant surveys, completed under the Florida Armed Occupation Act. The Claims and surveys mention a number of Maroon settlements, including Little Berry Branch’s Homestead, Charlie’s Town, and Abraham’s New Town; all located in Sumter County near the Withlacoochee River. The authors recommended further research be done at all three sites, however, none has yet been attempted.

Another site, Boggy Island, now called Kettle Island, located directly on the Withlacoochee River, was identified using the diary of a 19th century U.S. army general, Henry Prince. Prince's duty brought him to the Withlacoochee River in Central Florida twice, once in 1836 and again in 1842. Boggy Island, across the Withlacoochee from Fort Cooper, was a "hiding place but little known even amongst the Indians" (Prince 1837:April 25). In the interior of the island was a clearing where Maroons would seclude themselves "in time of war" (Prince 1837:April 25). According to the 1993 survey, the site itself is twenty square meters at about thirteen meters above sea level and has a cultural deposit twenty-five centimeters thick (Carr and Steele 1993:266). The authors concluded the site was “relatively undisturbed with only minimal damage resulting from bioturbation” and recommended further testing and preservation (Carr and Steele 1993:266).

Also among the sites identified by Carr and Steele (1993) is Peliklikaha. Alternatively known as the Williams’ Homestead, after the mid-19th century Euro-American settler who purchased the land, or Abraham’s Old Town, after the famous Maroon interpreter who lived at the site in the early 19th century (Baram 2012, Carr and Steele 1993:267); the site is the most thoroughly investigated Maroon village site in Florida. The name Peliklikaha, meaning “many
pons”, was given by Seminole allies and refers to the numerous flooded depressions that characterize the area (Carr and Steele 1993:267, Landers 2010:196). The site was raided and destroyed by the U.S Army in 1836 and the land was granted to the Williams family soon after. A surface survey was completed at the site in 1994 and over 300 artifacts were documented (Herron 1994). Unfortunately the master’s thesis documenting that survey remains unpublished (Weik 2002:104). However, in the late 1990s and early 2000s, Terrance Weik, a PhD. student at the University of Florida conducted excavations at the site that will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.

One other contemporary archaeological project in Central Florida is working to identify Maroon town sites. The project, referred to as “Looking for Angola,” is a collaborative, multidisciplinary, public anthropology program, which has been working since 2005 to identify the Maroon community of Angola on the Manatee River in the south Tampa Bay area (Baram 2012:108). Tampa Bay was the “last refuge” for Maroons following the U.S. occupation of the peninsula (Baram 2012:108) and although the settlement is not identified on any existing maps from the 19th century, written descriptions of the area by Euro-American pioneers mention the settlement. However, researchers are utilizing more than archival research and archaeological survey in their efforts to locate the site. When shovel test-pit survey demonstrated the need for more efficient approaches (Burger 2005, Baram 2008) the team turned to underwater survey of the river (Cozzi 2007), radar tomography survey of a nearby spring (Birken et al. 2008), and exploratory excavations (Baram 2010). This research has familiarized archaeologists with 19th century Euro-American settlements as well the unique characteristics of the riverine environment (Baram 2012:112), however, it has yet to identify the site of Angola.
This study represents a next step for Maroon archaeology in Florida. Rather than focusing on the identification of a new site, the purpose of this comparison is to utilize existing data from a Maroon site to build our understanding of Maroon life in the region. Maroon archaeologists in Florida, led by Uzi Baram and the “Finding Angola Project,” have recognized that given the unique challenges of Maroon archaeology, academic studies should be exhausting all of the possible avenues of research, from digital reconstruction to community collaboration. In many ways, Maroon archaeology in Florida is a microcosm of the greater field of African Diaspora archaeology. The earliest studies were accidents and a more critical approach has taken decades to develop. However, we are now looking to expand the field and produce more meaningful research.
CHAPTER 3
REGIONAL HISTORY

Florida is home to the earliest continuously occupied Euro-American city and the earliest free black settlement in the contemporary United States. However, through much of its colonial history, Florida was a frontier land. Although Europeans quickly decimated Native American populations on the peninsula, they failed to exert full control over the area. Florida became a refuge for escaping slaves, a means to political and economic independence for the Seminole, and a highly desired territory for the Spanish, British, and Americans alike. The contested landscape produced a range of opportunities and challenges for its residents and life in Florida was a truly unique experience. This chapter reviews Florida’s history from the arrival of the first European on the peninsula to statehood, with a focus on African and African American life and the effects of political turmoil on black lives in the region.

The First Spanish Period, 1565-1763

Florida as a Borderland

Europeans first reached the Florida coastline in 1513 when Ponce de Leon claimed the land for the king of Spain. The Spanish had great ambition for their conquests in the New World and “La Florida” extended far beyond the modern state of Florida. In the mid-16th century, Quebec was still considered part of Florida, and virtually all of North America was included in the Spanish maps of Tierra Florida at one point or another. However, it wasn’t until the French established Fort Carolina in 1564 that the Spanish colonization of the peninsula began in earnest (Gold 1969:3-4).

Despite colonial ambition, the Spanish conquest of Florida was not an overwhelming success. British pirates in the Gulf stream, like Sir Francis Drake, posed more of a nuisance than a real threat to the earliest Spanish colonists, however, according to historian Robert Gold, “the
loss of the 1588 Armada, the continuous expenses of the dynastic and religious wars, the erosion of the Spanish colonial machinery… and the continuing harassments of the other European powers eventually debilitated Hispanic control of the New World” (1969:5). The Spanish had little control over the land beyond St. Augustine’s fortifications. The colonists attempted to gain greater control of the region through the use of missions in the late 16th century and these settlements, first Jesuit, then Franciscan, formed a border between the Spanish and the English and French colonies to the north and west (Larose 2014:87). However, as evidenced by the Native American uprising of 1597, they did little to truly control local populations. In addition, traders increasingly moved contraband items through the borderland. Opportunistic Euro-Americans and Native Americans traveling across the region exchanged rum, guns, cattle, and slaves without regard for Spanish authority, and eventually even the U.S. military regularly intruded into Spanish territory on slave raiding missions (Frank 2014:142).

**Early Marronage in Florida**

The first enslaved Africans arrived in Florida with Spanish explorers as early as 1526. The Lucas Vasquez de Avillon expedition of that year consisted of six hundred Spanish settlers and a handful of African slaves who performed a range of jobs, from agricultural labor to skilled trades (Rivers 2000). During the first Spanish period, most slaves entering Florida were Criollos or Ladinos, born in the Americas, but those that did come from Africa had their origin carefully documented (Landers 2014:74). Records of catechisms, baptisms, marriages, and burials show that the most numerous ethnic group was Congos, but the African population in St. Augustine included Ibo, Coromante, Susu, Wolof, Peul, Ganga, Bara, Besi, Dudrian, Mondongo, Bambara, Limba, Moyo, and Pati, among others (Landers 2014:76). An ever-greater number of African slaves were brought to the region as its Native American inhabitants succumbed to foreign
disease and force. Consequently, “African languages and religious, social, and cultural systems were constantly renewed and did not atrophy into some more creolized form” as they did in the American colonies (Landers 2014:81).

Despite the relatively lenient nature of Spanish slavery in Florida, compared to the system in the British colonies, marronage occurred regularly. When Pedro Menendez de Aviles established St. Augustine he found that “the allure of escape into the peninsula’s vast wilderness and slaves’ desire for freedom over any form of harsh or mild servitude” made slavery difficult to maintain (Rivers 2000:3) and the settlement experienced chronic labor shortages throughout its formative years. Florida, especially the interior of the peninsula, was gradually building a reputation as a refuge for African runaways from both Spanish and British territories (Rivers 2000), when, in 1683, Spain began a policy of religious clemency, granting freedom to runaways from the British colonies if they converted to Roman Catholicism. The Spanish also granted some families land and recruited men as militia to defend territorial holdings (Landers 1999, Franklin and Schweninger 1999). In 1738, Fort Mosé, north of St. Augustine, became the first legally sanctioned free black settlement in North America, welcoming both fugitive slaves and Native Americans (Franklin and Schweninger 1999). While Maroons still had the formidable tasks of escape from slavery and survival in the wilderness, Florida had become a safe haven for those who reached it.

Florida’s Native People

The region was not so safe for Florida’s indigenous people, however; a combination of biological, military, and political violence nearly exterminated indigenous Floridians within two centuries of Europeans’ arrival in the New World. Prior to European colonization of the peninsula, Florida was home to a number of cultural groups. On the east coast the Tequesta occupied the area from Biscayne Bay to the Florida Keys; to their north were the Jaega, Jobe,
and the Aïs in the Indian River area; and the Timucua in the northeast and southern Georgia. On the west coast, the Calusa dominated the southern coastline with the Tocabagos to their north and the Apalachee and Pensacola in the northwest and the Panhandle. These groups all interacted differently with the Spanish and French explorers who intruded on their land, however, disease, new ways of thinking, dramatic social and political change, and economic opportunities accompanied the Europeans wherever they went (Milanich 2000:10).

Although Florida was not formally colonized until 1565, measles, typhus, tuberculosis, influenza, and smallpox were introduced by the first Spanish explorers in the area as early as 1513 and quickly decimated local populations, leaving the peninsula mostly uninhabited by the early 1700s (Larose 2014:86). The Timucua tribe, for example, was composed of as many as 200,000 individuals, with at least 35 unique chiefdoms when sustained contact with French and Spanish colonists began in 1564, but by 1700 their numbers were in the hundreds (Milanich 2000:1-11). The spread of disease and breakdown of social order was encouraged by the Franciscan mission system, which was established among the Timucua in the 1580s and encompassed nearly the entire native population by 1620 (Milanich 2000:2). Under Spanish direction, individuals from untouched areas repopulated villages heavily impacted by disease, spreading disease further and destroying existing social organization (Milanich 2000). Eventually, most Timucua were centralized in missions surrounding St. Augustine and were engaged in commercial ceramic production providing the bulk of the pottery used at the military outpost and surrounding town.

What Native American society remained at the turn of the 18th century was dissolved by the early 19th century. Some groups simply died out, like the Aïs, who had essentially disappeared by 1760. Some were captured and enslaved by British funded Creek and Yamasee
raiding missions in the first half of the 18th century (Weisman 2000b:137). Others who had been converted to Catholicism or lived near the remaining Spanish missions, including some Tequesta, Timucua, Apalachee, and Calusa fled to Cuba with the Spanish in 1763 at the close of the French and Indian War. Some survivors from the Timucua and Apalachee may have been absorbed into the confederacy of Creek living in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and eventually Florida (Howard 2014:110), however, the degree to which this blending of tribes occurred remains unknown (Weisman 2000b:303). Eventually, the “exodus or extinction of Florida’s indigenous nations” left a huge territory vacant, and in the mid-18th century, Muscogee groups, who came to be known as the Seminoles, “establishing flourishing villages in the interior savannas” (Landers 1999:67; MacCauley 2000[1887]:471).

**Seminole Origins and Ethnogenesis**

Seminole division from the Muscogee or Creek Confederacy was rooted in both the heterogeneous nature of Muscogee society and the political and economic opportunities offered by the Spanish. The Muscogee were descendants of pre-historic southeastern mound-building societies with pluralistic cultural and biological origins (Stojanowski 2005; Weisman 2000, 2007) but a shared basic cultural pattern centered on corn agriculture and a chiefdom type of social organization (Weisman 2000:137). A loose confederation established for trade and military purposes following the ravages of European disease and the Indian slave trade in the 16th and 17th century, the Muscogee lived in autonomous villages in present day Alabama, Georgia, and Tennesee but were united by their use of Muskogean languages (Kersey 1987:11). The Muscogee were penetrated by European merchants, missionaries, and government officials early on, and were recognized by Euro-Americans as one of the five “civilized tribes” for their adoption of European architecture and dress, and some aspects of Christianity and Western government (Katz 1986:135).
Internal stresses within Muscogee society (Kersey 1987:11) and the availability of Florida land brought southern Muscogee to the peninsula in the 18th century. There, they grew increasingly distant from the Muscogee Confederacy both politically and culturally. The name Seminole, comes from the Muskogee word Simano-li meaning separatist or renegade (MacCauley 2000[1887]:471), and may be derived from the Spanish word cimarrón, used to refer to the self-liberated slaves whom the Seminole quickly made political and social alliances with. The new Seminole confederation was similar to the Muscogee Confederacy, but had even more loosely organized towns with a great deal of local autonomy and cultural diversity. Most of the Seminole had immigrated to Florida for greater independence and the rules of membership in Seminole society were very flexible (Mulroy 1993a:7). The Seminole came from different regions, spoke various languages, and adopted Africans, Yuchis, Yamasees, and some indigenous Floridians into their society as well (Mulroy 1993a). They were noted for their tolerance for individualistic, non-conformist behavior and the assimilation of external customs came to be recognized as central to Seminole society (Larose 2014:90). Eventually Seminole culture adapted to the Florida landscape, both social and environmental, and the hallmarks of contemporary Florida Seminole life, like the chickee, the consumption of the koonti plant as soffkee, and a patchwork style of dress, emerged. Some aspects of Muscogee life were retained by the Seminoles; including the stickball game, black drink, matrilineal descent, and the Green Corn Dance; which became part of a new syncretic Seminole culture (Weisman 1989:179).

Seminole ethnogenesis was also political. The Muscogee aligned with the British in the mid-1700s, but the Seminole now stood to benefit more from alliances with the Spanish (Larose 2014:87). The Seminole traded honey, cow and deer hides, and garden produce for European ceramics, weapons, mirrors, horse tack, and glass beads among other things (Weisman
1989:179). Although the Muscogee were once Spanish enemies, the Spanish saw the Seminole as a barrier against American encroachment and often traded with them in St. Augustine, where the Seminole came to sell cattle and horses (Schafer 1996:215). The Seminole, although settled on lands Spain had claimed as its own (Kersey 1987:11), were an asset to the continued existence of Spanish society in Florida. Increasingly, the Seminole identified themselves not just as separate from the Muscogee, but also in opposition to the British and eventually the United States. Eventually, Seminole opposition to U.S. expansionism earned them the title: “The Unconquered People.”

**The British Period, 1763-1783**

**Regional Growth**

The Treaty of Paris and the end of the Seven Years War in 1763 signaled the beginning of twenty years of British rule in Florida, the establishment of more large-scale plantations, and the temporary eradication of Maroon freedom in Florida (Rivers 2000, Restal 2005, Landers 1999). While the evacuated Spanish from St. Augustine and Africans from Fort Mose struggled on new homesteads in Cuba following their loss of the territory (Landers 1999:66), the New British governor of Florida, James Grant, quickly began a program designed to turn Florida into a lucrative cotton state on par with South Carolina (Proctor 1978:5). Grant promoted colonial development by offering prominent Carolina planters political offices and generous land grants (Landers 1999:66). Grant’s efforts were aided by European writers’ continued idealization of the region. Writings about the region presented Florida as an oasis, rarely distinguishing between the people and the flora. People were drawn to Florida because of highly romanticized conceptualizations of the region, and despite mounting evidence to the contrary, Europeans “continued to see Florida as a natural paradise full of unexploited potential… for almost three centuries” (Murphree 2006:2).
During the British Period, veteran planters from South Carolina and Georgia brought thousands of Africans into Florida. British brought slaves to Florida from the Gambia, the Windward, Grain, Gold and Guinea coasts of West Africa, and from Angola with one locally based shipping company and one Savannah based company managing the majority of the trade (Landers 2014:77). Over sixty percent of the slaves on Governor James Grant’s model plantation north of St. Augustine had been brought directly from Africa and as many as 1,000 new African slaves were trafficked into Florida in 1771 alone (Landers 2014:77). These African slaves built extensive estates along the St. Marys and St. Johns Rivers in North Florida and along the Mosquito Coast south of St. Augustine. They produced rice, cotton, indigo, oranges, sugarcane, and cut timber (Landers 2000:4).

Black Seminole Origins

The British also brought a much more rigid racial order into Florida. The majority of Spanish citizens left Florida when it transferred to British hands and relaxed Spanish racial attitudes were quickly replaced by a “restrictive and race-based” social order (Rivers 2000:67). A binary, white/black, caste system took the place of the Spanish three caste, white owners/free blacks/black slaves, system (Schafer 1996:225) and free blacks could no longer count on the social and political freedoms that they had enjoyed under the Spanish.

According to historian Thomas Larose, “the social, political, and trade relations between Seminoles, Spanish, and African populations in Florida were thrown into disarray when the British took possession of Florida in 1763” (Larose 2014:90). Although the occupants of Fort Mosé were evacuated to Cuba by the Spanish, most liberated Africans in the region were forced to abandon their property and livelihoods and seek refuge in the interior of the peninsula (Landers 1991, Larose 2014, Rivers 2000). Maroons could no longer depend on the legal protection of the Spanish and instead sought alliances with Seminole chiefs such as Payne,
Micanopy, and Bowlegs (Restal 2005). Gradually, a distinctive Black Seminole society was formed.

Maroon culture and ethnogenesis from 1763 on is tied closely to that of the Seminoles. Maroons played critical roles in Seminole interactions with European and Euro-American powers, often acting as interpreters and military advisors. Known at the time as “Negro Seminoles” (Howard 2014:111) and often referred to as African Seminoles or Black Seminoles (Weik 2002), Maroons solidified their military alliance with the Seminole through the exchange of both economic and cultural resources (Littlefield 1977). Maroons introduced the Seminoles to a variety of tropical cultivation methods, including rice production, while adopting certain Seminole dishes such as soffkee (Opala 1980). Maroons are even reported to have taken part in the Green Corn Dance (MacCauley 2000[1887]). In some ways, this cultural blending was facilitated by existing cultural similarities. The various African ethnic groups represented in Maroon society shared a number of cultural institutions with the Muscogee and hence, the Seminole; including matrilineal organization with hereditary chiefs, a council of elders, religious specialists, and communal living supported by agricultural production (Larose 2014:89).

A certain level of separation existed between the two groups, however. For example, some intermarriage occurred between the groups, but it remained primarily on the leadership level with the purpose of cementing community relations (Larose 2014:90). Maroons and Seminoles also lived together in some cases, such as Bowlegs’ Town, but other Maroons resided in autonomous black villages (Restal 2005:64) and Maroons continued to identify with their African heritage, using languages, religions, and marriage customs distinctively different from those of the Seminoles (Larose 2014:90). Differences in clothing preferences were also noted in the early 1800s. Maroons preferred to wear pants instead of leggings, and hats or turbans instead
of headbands. Nevertheless, some Africans adopted Seminole customs and dress wholeheartedly, “participating in these communities with the same rights as a native and the same voice in community affairs” (Larose 2014:90).

Although some historical accounts suggest that Maroons were essentially re-enslaved by the Seminole and many Maroons did provide the Seminoles regular agricultural gifts (Restal 2005; Littlefield 1977), the relationship between the two groups was not one of masters and slaves. The British encouraged the practice of slavery by Native Americans with the hopes that groups who accepted slavery would not take in runaways fleeing from European masters. However, while the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Muscogee adopted a form of slavery akin to European chattel slavery, the Seminole did not (Katz 1986:107). The Seminole did hold slaves, typically defeated Yamasee, however, these individuals were permitted to marry Seminoles and their children were born free and considered social equals (Landers 1999:68). If the Seminole did hold Africans and African Americans as slaves, the connection between master and slave was tenuous, with independent Maroon communities living miles away from the chiefs with whom they held military alliances and providing only a small percentage of their crops or livestock to the Seminole annually. In fact, the Maroons position as intermediaries led some U.S. officials to suggest that they had control over the Seminoles, describing them “as the group who would determine war or peace with the United States … [and accusing them] of killing Native Seminoles who violated their decisions” (Twyman 1999:18). Some U.S. congressional documents from the Territorial Period, produced by Florida governors, Seminole Indian agents, U.S. army generals, and Euro-American slaveholders, state specifically: “Negroes govern the Seminole Indians” (Twyman 1999:16). The interpretation of Maroons as Seminole slaves seems to be more reflective of Euro-American expectations, or fears, than actual social relations. While
it may have been politically convenient for Euro-Americans to suggest that the Seminole were stealing their slaves, Maroons more likely held a position akin to tenant farmers or even middleman brokers in the eyes of the Seminole (Larose 2014:89).

Maroon numbers in Florida swelled over time. East and West Florida remained loyal to Britain during the American Revolution and the region was rife with conflict, which enabled the escape of slaves and promoted alliances with both Native Americans and the British, who were now offering freedom in return for military service (Rivers 2000, Landers 1999). What’s more, British Loyalists from across the American colonies fled to Florida during the war, and then to Bermuda in 1784, and many of their slaves took advantage of the situation and took shelter with the Seminoles (Larose 2014:90). Although the transfer of Florida to Britain disrupted Maroon life in Florida, Maroon numbers grew during this era and spawned the Black Seminole alliance.

**The Second Spanish Period, 1783-1821**

**Political Intrigue and The First Seminole War**

In 1783, Florida returned to Spanish hands in exchange for the Bahamas and Gibralter, however, the political chaos continued as the British persisted in their efforts to maintain their increasingly limited interests in the wider region and the US sought to expand south into Florida. Spanish officials in Florida dealt with British sponsored Creek and Yamassee raiding missions on the peninsula, constant border disputes with the United States, and the presence of American loyalists on the peninsula, which eventually led to the Patriot Rebellion. In general, Spain was losing its already tenuous grip on Florida, and in 1790, new laws were passed lowering the standard for land grants in the colony. Settlers were no longer required to convert to Catholicism to receive land, simply swear their loyalty to the Spanish crown. Within a few months, over 300 whites and 1,000 slaves had settled in Florida (Landers 1999:74). Anglo settlers established
plantations primarily along the St. Mary’s River, a buffer zone between Florida and Georgia, and despite their oath of loyalty, Spanish officials described as the planters as being “without God or king” (Landers 1999:71). Additionally, the government subsidy, the *situado*, which Floridians relied upon for essential goods, was often late and didn’t fulfill the community’s needs, leading to illicit trade (Landers 1999:74), which persisted even after trade regulations were lifted in 1793.

Florida’s slave trade, partially legal and partially illegal, remained strong despite the political turmoil. Spanish ship and tax records clearly show that Africans were imported into Florida in ever increasing numbers throughout the Second Spanish Period. Zephaniah Kingsley, a slave trader and planter, made four trips to Africa for slaves between 1803 and 1806, and historian Jane Landers has calculated that over 3,000 Africans arrived in St. Augustine during the thirty-eight year period (Landers 2014:81). Looking at legal voyages alone, “there were 32 direct voyages from Africa to Spanish Florida between 1793 and 1821, maybe more“ (Landers 2014:81). Sixteen of the vessels arriving from Africa carried 1,575 slaves, an average of 98 people per ship, which, if taken as a constant, means that 3,136 Africans arrived in St. Augustine legally in the Second Spanish Period. Consequently, African born slaves continued to represent a higher percentage of the Florida slave population than in the U.S. territories (Millett 2013:149).

Africans were also arriving in Florida independently during this era although escaped slaves would not be protected by Spanish policy for much longer. In 1790, Thomas Jefferson, the first U.S. Secretary of State, successfully petitioned the Spanish governor of Florida, Juan Nepomuceno de Quesada, to stop the protection policy and return any future escapees to their American masters. Nevertheless, Africans; including Senegalese, Asanti, Corromentee, Ibo, Egba and Kongo people (Larose 2014:89); and African-Americans born in the British colonies
escaped slavery and began fighting for their independence on the Florida frontier. Some joined the Black Seminole alliance immediately, while others fought alongside Spanish and British allies (Landers 1999:112-115, Millet 2013:151).

This militarization was necessary on the part of Maroons and free blacks as the conflict between European and Euro-American powers evolved into a more sweeping effort on the part of the United States to push not only the Spanish and British out of the region, but also force the Seminoles out of their settlements in western and central Florida, and re-enslave their black allies (Landers 1999, Littlefield 1977). Included in that effort were the Patriot Wars of 1810 and 1812. The skirmishes, in which frontiersmen within Florida and from neighboring Louisiana and Georgia attempted to seize Spanish West and East Florida for the United States, managed to place far western Florida in U.S. hands but were ultimately unsuccessful in seizing the peninsula. However, during the attacks, invaders from Georgia destroyed many Seminole and Maroon towns in modern Alachua County (Rivers 2000:7).

Subsequently, many Maroons, cognizant of the U.S. military’s intentions of seizing Florida, responded to British recruitment offers. The British sought men to fight on the Gulf coast and at New Orleans in the final years of the War of 1812. Some Maroons who aligned themselves with British forces manned the fort at Prospect Bluff, also known as the “Negro Fort” (Rivers 2000, Millet 2013). Built by the British in 1814 about ten miles north of Apalachicola Bay on the Apalachicola River, operations at Prospect Bluff were dedicated to recruiting and training Maroons and Native Americans. When the British evacuated Florida in 1815, they left the fort in the hands of about 400 Maroons, only a handful of whom had completed training (Millett 2013, Apthecker 1983). Over the next year, the fort attracted 800 additional Maroons to the surrounding area where they cleared land, established homesteads, and farmed. The growth
of a free black settlement made white planters in nearby Georgia and Mississippi uncomfortable (Rivers 2000:7) and the fort came to be known amongst Euro-Americans as a threat to Southern slavery and everyday peace (Apthecker 1983:31).

In 1816, under the pretenses of protecting free movement up and down the river, U.S. forces illegally entered Spanish territory in order to attack the fort (Rivers 2000:7). They hit the garrison’s powder magazine with a pre-heated cannonball and the explosion leveled the fort, killing all but 30 of the 300 occupants (Apthecker 1983:34). Some of the survivors were killed, others were returned to slavery, however, many of the Maroons living at the fort and the surrounding area dispersed throughout West and Central Florida. Some joined the newly settled town of Angola on the Manatee River near Tampa, where many former Alachua Seminoles and Maroons had fled in 1812, while others joined existing communities or settled new towns in Central Florida (Mahon 1991, Millett 2013:190). Others, pushed out of their homes along the Suwannee River by Andrew Jackson’s army would, join these settlers two years later.

**Cosmopolitan East Florida**

In the Second Spanish Period and the early Territorial Period in Florida, the peninsula’s population centered around St. Augustine and Pensacola (Floyd Smith 1973:16), however, these were still relatively small cities with military control barely extending beyond the city walls. Travelers to St. Augustine were often unimpressed by what they found. In 1824, eccentric French émigré, attorney, and planter, Achille Murat, nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte, suggested that the town looked more like an Italian market village than an American city (Tebeau and Marina 1999:122) and four years later Ralph Waldo Emerson took note of the lazy people and bad housekeeping practiced throughout the settlement. He also questioned why the people of St. Augustine dug cellars when they only filled with water (Tebeau and Marina 1999:122).
However, historian Jane Landers argues that while some would like to suggest that Florida in the 18th century and early 19th century was a backwater, it was far from stagnation (Landers 1999:69). According to Landers, “the province was more than a garrison if less than a thriving metropolis” (Landers 1999:69). Despite Spain’s restrictive mercantilist trade policies and continued political instability, people made livings “and sometimes even improved their lot” in East Florida (Landers 1999:69).

In fact, during the Second Spanish Era, East Florida saw an influx of homesteaders and investors, eager to take advantage of generous colonial policies and conscious of the US’s expansionist desires. English interest and influence persisted throughout the Spanish period as “land-hungry” US citizens moved into the peninsula at a lightening rate (Tebeau and Marine 1999:79). Spain opened the territory to these entrepreneurs when the British exodus from the region left a meager population, unable to sustain the plantation economy established in the previous twenty years (Howard 2014:110). In 1790 alone three hundred Euro-Americans brought 1,000 black slaves into the territory. Over the next fourteen years, 750 individuals, accompanied by a slave labor force of over 5,000, took loyalty oaths in exchange for land (Rivers 2000:68). The few remaining British were joined by “Spanish soldiers and returning families, their slaves, free blacks, white and black immigrants from the United States, refugees of both races from the Caribbean especially Saint-Domingue (Haiti), sailors and opportunists of many nationalities, and Seminole Indians in the interior of the peninsula” (Coker and Parker 1996:159). Additionally, in 1777, Minorcan, Greek, and Italian settlers abandoned Andrew Turnbull’s failed indigo plantation at New Smyrna and found refuge in St. Augustine (Landers 1999:75). The Minorcans and their fellow Mediterranean emigrants assimilated easily into St. Augustine’s cosmopolitan cultural blend. Most found work as fishermen, merchants, or farmers
(Landers 1999:76). As a result, East Florida, especially St. Augustine, experienced great cultural and racial heterogeneity in the Second Spanish Period and into the Territorial Period.

**Urban Slavery and the Task System**

Although the majority of slaves lived and worked on rural plantations, a growing percentage of enslaved people worked and lived in cities. In the early 19th century, at least 20 percent of the population of numerous Southern cities, including New Orleans, Richmond, and Charleston, were enslaved individuals (Wade 1964:3). In Florida, slaves represented approximately one-third of the urban population in 1850 and towns like Fernandina, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Tampa, and Apalachicola likely offered better conditions than rural plantations (Rivers 2000:78-79). According to St. Augustine historian Thomas Graham, while the large majority of East Florida slaves resided on plantations in rural areas, living and working in relative isolation, “the urban environment moderated slavery’s harshness and provided opportunities to broaden the sterile world of the bondsman (St. Augustine historian Thomas Graham as quoted in Rivers 2000:78). In towns, slaves were able to build larger social communities, which often included free blacks, and were typically subjected to less extreme labor conditions than their peers working in the Middle Florida cotton industry (Rivers 2000).

Additionally, during the Second Spanish Period slaves in Florida’s cities were not necessarily under the direct supervision of their masters and worked a variety of skilled jobs. According to historian William Rogers, in Apalachicola, “blacks were fairly unrestricted, some living apart from their masters in rented houses” (Rivers 2000:78) and “many lived in their own homes, away from their master’s residence, almost as if they were free men” (Rivers 2000:81). In cities and towns, enslaved Africans provided cheap labor in various industries as well as serving the domestic sphere (Wade 1964:4). Slaves participated in every aspect of the economy.
Men butchered meat and sold food in the market, fished and sold their catch, built and sailed boats and ships, farmed, and practiced a number of skilled and semi-skilled crafts including carpentry, blacksmithing, cabinet making, painting, plastering, shoemaking, and masonry. Women were housekeepers, cooks, washerwomen, wet-nurses, seamstresses, and domestic servants (Martin 2004:21-22). St. Augustine was no different; some slaves even managed stores, oversaw farms, and directed their master’s homes (Rivers 2010:78). The occupants of the Hernández orange grove were among St. Augustine’s unique enslaved work force; both living apart from their master and managing his commercial properties.

However, it was not just in Florida’s cities that more liberal methods of work organization were employed. Although common depictions of plantation slavery focus on a labor hierarchy, with slaves under the constant supervision of an overseer, work organization varied greatly from place to place. The task system was particularly common in Spanish East Florida and “came to epitomize labor organization in most developed coastal areas…it was especially the case where sea island cotton, sugar, indigo, rice, and some other staple crops were grown” (Rivers 2010:69). Examples of work schedules come from the private writings of planters Zephaniah Kingsley and Winston Stephens and reflect the use of a task system on both large and small operations. Under the task system slaves typically started work at 5:30 AM and finishing by 5:00 PM, if not earlier. According to Kingsley and Stephens, slaves tended to be happier with this system than the traditional work gang. Relaxed working conditions would soon end, however, following the U.S. acquisition of Florida from Spain.
The Territorial Period, 1821-1845

Changing Race Relations

Zephaniah Kingsley, a slave trader, maritime merchant, shipbuilder, and planter arrived in Florida from Saint Domingue in 1803. Kingsley and his wife, Anna Madgigaine Jai, a Senegalese woman and Kingsley’s former slave, raised their four children in Florida, first at his Laurel Grove Plantation south of St. Augustine and then at Kingsley Plantation on Fort George Island near Jacksonville (Schafer 1996:214). Kingsley and Madgigaine Jai were just one among many interracial couples in Spanish Florida who raised their biracial children openly. However, the family and their slaves, excluding two married daughters, were forced to move to Haiti in 1837 following the imposition of a more rigid racial system which threatened the freedom and civil rights of the family’s free black members (Schafer 1996:225).

Although the U.S. had long sought control over Florida Maroons, beginning in the Territorial Period, the United States gradually dismantled Florida’s once tolerant race relations. For many years, St. Augustine, as well as the rest of Florida, was home to free blacks and refugees from the United States (Tebeau and Marina 1999:82). In general, race relations were “milder and more flexible” than in the southern U.S. colonies (Rivers 2010:66) and complex legal code protected the rights of Florida’s citizens of color, both free and enslaved. Like Zephaniah Kingsley, George F. Clarke and Carlos Clarke had black wives and openly raised mixed race families, Francisco X. Sanchez raised two mulatto children with black women, and “many East Florida circles thus accepted miscegenation and interracial families as a part of everyday life in the region” (Rivers 2010:10). But marriage and rights of inheritance were far from the most permissive laws; slaves could even own property and sue their owners under the law in the Second Spanish Period (Rivers 2010:66).
Unlike in 1763, many people remained when the US took over in 1821, and so did their relaxed racial attitudes (Rivers 2010:69). For many years in East and West Florida, the Spanish changed incoming peoples’ attitudes towards slavery, not the other way around (Rivers 2010:68). Remaining British loyalists had already adjusted and many newcomers recognized that the ease of escape in Florida meant that it was to the slave owner’s advantage to keep their slaves satisfied if not happy. This situation was in stark contrast to the Middle Florida plantation codes, however, and eventually U.S. administrators began enforcing policies aimed at bringing East and West Florida in line with their plans for the peninsula (Howard 2014:109). City ordinances in Florida cities became more restrictive for both free and enslaved blacks (Floyd Smith 1973:107). One Apalachicola ordinance issued a $5 fine for anyone allowing their slave to reside in the city without proper supervision and a $100 fine for hiring out a slave (Floyd Smith 1973:107). Strict slave codes were imposed to ensure against marronage or rebellion (Rivers 2000, Landers 1991) and, although the Adams-Onis Treaty guaranteed free blacks and Native Americans the rights of United States citizens, the pact was largely ignored. Florida’s new American administrators were preoccupied with the potential of mass rebellion and made every effort to prevent it. Fulfilling those fears, slaves continued to escape throughout Florida, joining the Seminoles and independent Maroon communities (Millett 2014:41).

In growing Middle Florida, exaggerated concerns over slave insurrection and fear of the Seminoles supported the imposition of harsh slave codes and a “deeply conservative, patriarchal, and violent” culture (Millett 2014:40). Middle Florida was a microcosm of extremes, reminiscent of the antebellum cotton kingdom in the Deep South (Millett 2014:40; Rivers 2000:8). Planters in Middle Florida were committed to the extension of plantation slavery and the demand for slaves was high (Millett 2014:40). Although the importation of slaves was
banned beginning in 1808, the slave trade continued legally and illegally until Emancipation in Florida. When internal trade could not supply the desired laborers, secluded beach drop-offs were utilized to bring Africans into the territory (Brown and Rivers 2014:173). Planters even actively ignored the Adams-Onís Treaty by aiding slave catchers who trespassed on reserved Seminole lands to capture free black men, women, and children (Rivers 2000:11-12). In 1832, representatives from Middle Florida went “far beyond the normal stricture applicable to slave management and slave insurrection by attempting to ban manumission and white sexual relations with blacks” (Rivers 2000:12). This prohibition contradicted decades of convention in East and West Florida, and pushed planters like Zephaniah Kingsley to reconsider their investments in the region.

The Second Seminole War

According to historian Daniel Schafer, at the beginning of the American Territorial Period, Florida’s new Euro-American residents were land hungry, “they had not waited for legislation or deeds before settling on tracts of open land… more than 450 settlers from the United States were living near Pensacola prior to final approval of the Adams-Onis Treaty” (Schafer 1996:212). The majority of new settlers were draw to Middle Florida, between the Apalachicola and Suwannee Rivers (Schafer 1996:212) and the growth and prosperity of the region “depended on pushing armed blacks and Indians away from the plantation lands and into remote areas of the peninsula” (Rivers 2000:11). In the 1820s and 1830s Maroons and Seminoles were forced further and further into the great “river of grass” covering South Florida by raiding on the part of the US Army, who, along with their northern Creek allies, succeeded in returning about 300 escaped slaves to slavery (Rivers 2000)

In the 1823 Treaty of Moultrie Creek, Seminoles ceded the majority of their land in north-central Florida to the U.S. and moved onto lands reserved for Native Americans and
“associated blacks” from Ocala to southern Polk County (Millett 2014:41; Rivers 2000:12, Littlefield 1977). However, the territories were small compared to the needs of the population, and difficult to cultivate. The removal of entire clans from the Panhandle and upper-peninsula “resulted in severe privation” (Rivers 2000:12). In 1830, Congress passed the Indian Removal Act and following a series of treaties in the early 1830s, the Seminole were expected to move off of the Florida reservation to lands in Oklahoma by 1835. However, many of the treaties had been made under questionable circumstances and as the U.S. military realized Seminole plans to resist removal, both sides prepared for war. About 1,600 blacks lived with the Seminole at the time and 1,100 more slaves lived on the plantations to the north and east of the reservation (Rivers 2000:13). The encroaching slave frontier and continued efforts on the part of the U.S. government to move Native Americans to the western states, led Seminoles and Maroons to begin raiding East and Middle Florida plantations in 1835. The violence soon escalated into the Second Seminole War and the largest slave rebellion in United States history (Rivers 2000:13). Over 1,000 slaves joined the brutal and highly destructive guerilla war, which “laid waste to large sections of Middle Florida’s plantation complex” and by its end in 1842, it had become America’s longest and costliest “Indian” War (Millett 2014:41).

**End of the Second Seminole War**

In the end, the fight turned into a war of attrition with the better-funded and better-supplied U.S. army simply declaring an end to war in 1842. A new reservation was established for the Seminole and those who refused to settle there were rounded up and moved west. Maroons, both new and established freedmen, were either re-enslaved and returned to their former masters in the Southern colonies or were assimilated into Seminole society. Some who joined the Seminole remained in South Florida while others were forcibly removed in 1843 and
confined to “Indian Territory” (contemporary Oklahoma) where their status as free Americans remained unclear (Littlefield 1977, Franklin and Schweninger 1999).

The Florida Armed Occupation Act of 1842 was created as a safeguard against future slave and Native American uprisings. The Act granted heads of households 160 acres of land in Central Florida, at least two miles away from any military post, with the stipulations that settlers be able to protect themselves (Knetsch and George 1998:64). In order to be eligible for the grant, the settler had to be a Florida resident; agree to reside on the land for five consecutive years; clear, enclose and cultivate at least five acres of land during their first year; and build a house on the land within the first year (Knetsch and George 1998:64). The intention of the Act was to tame the wild Florida interior (Knetsch and George 1998), both the landscape and the people. The land descriptions included in several of the permits, however, show that the lands being granted were not exactly “unsettled” wilderness; they were often the sites of former Seminole, Miccosukee, and Maroon settlements (Carr and Steele 1993).

In 1845, Florida was granted statehood, however, the territory was already well on its way to becoming part of the American South. By this time, free black society in Florida had been quashed, and the state was no longer the political haven it had once been. Following the passage of the Armed Occupation Act, the influx of new settlers created even greater demand for land and the U.S. government continued advocating for Native American removal. In 1855, the third Seminole War was little more than a final removal effort, which pushed the tribe further south than ever before. Although Florida’s population was still relatively diverse and Africans continued to arrive in the region until Emancipation, Florida had essentially become the cotton state that James Grant imagined in the 18th century.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

Study Sites

Peliklikaha

Among the North Central Florida settlements that received Maroons fleeing from the destroyed fort at Prospect Bluff, was Peliklikaha. Also known as Abraham’s Old Town, after the Black Seminole interpreter who had lived at the Negro Fort as a young man (Millett 2014:41) and who served as one of the settlement’s leaders (Porter 1971), Peliklikaha was a small agricultural settlement. Maroons affiliated with Seminole Chief Micanopy had originally settled the town in 1813 after the destruction of Micanopy’s Alachua villages in that year (Howard 2014:113). The site’s main period of occupation lasted just twenty-three years, between 1813 and 1836; however, in that time the town’s Maroon inhabitants established themselves as successful agriculturalists and frontier traders (Weik 2002). Well known to allies and enemies alike, Peliklikaha was referred to in numerous traveler’s accounts and military records from the Seminole Wars and located on various 19th century government maps (Cohen 1964[1836], McCall 1974[1868]). These records refer to the Maroons’ abundant corn, rice, bean, melon, and pumpkin fields, as well as their large herds of cattle and other livestock (Cohen 1964[1836]) and suggest that the town had at least ten wooden structures and up to one hundred inhabitants (McCall 1974[1868]). These numbers, as part of military records, should be considered with caution, however, in general, historical records suggest that Peliklikaha was a small but burgeoning agricultural town at the time of its destruction by General Eustis and his troops in the Second Seminole War.

Although recorded variously in historic records, Peliklikaha was not documented archaeologically until the 1990s. Located in Sumter County, less than ten miles from the
Withlacoochee River, the site was first registered as part of the Seminole Heritage Preservation Project, a survey of all known sites of Seminole affiliation in Florida (Carr and Steele 1993). As Seminole and Maroon life was closely intertwined in the 19th century, Maroon settlements of the time period were also included in the project. Researchers identified Peliklikaha, along with a number of other Seminole and Maroon sites, while reviewing land surveys from the 1842 Armed Occupation Act, and subsequently conducted a surface survey at the site. A Spanish olive jar fragment, an iron adze, and a button were collected in the 1992 survey and it was suggested that the site, which had good preservation, be considered for further investigation (Carr and Steele 1993:267). Shortly after the completion of the Seminole Heritage Preservation Project, Jordan Herron, a graduate student at the University of South Carolina, conducted a second surface survey at the site (Herron 1994). Herron collected over 300 artifacts, however, the master’s thesis in which he reports his data remains unpublished (Weik 2002).

Terry Weik of the University of Florida directed the most extensive archaeological research at the site to date in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Working in short phases from the spring of 1998 until 2001 (Weik 2002:104), Weik and his volunteers dug over 200 shovel tests and over 100 auger tests. Weik first established a Cartesian grid in order to establish northern and eastern site boundaries (access to the western edge of the site was denied and the site’s southern boundary was disturbed by a modern road), then test units of various sizes were placed judgementally as the “return for labor invested did not encourage time intensive sampling or the use of numerous test pits” (Weik 2002:104-106). Soil was screened using a ¼” mesh and soil samples were collected from features (Weik 2002:106). Over 2,300 artifacts were recovered, including faunal bone, glass beads, pipe-fragments, nails, and bottle glass (Weik 2002).
Although materials from an earlier occupation, including lithics and pre-colonial pottery, and a later occupation, including 20\textsuperscript{th} century glass and plastics, were recovered, Weik (2002) deals primarily with the 19\textsuperscript{th} century occupation of the site and this paper will look exclusively at materials from this time period. Additionally, although the author has undertaken some re-analysis of the materials collected by Weik, the following analysis relies exclusively on Weik’s (2002) identifications and data. Future research will incorporate newly collected data, such as faunal analysis, however, it is has not been incorporated into the present paper.

Figure 4-1. Terry Weik refitting ceramics at FLMNH, photo by Cathy Keen, from Explore Magazine. Volume 6, Issue 2. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1996.

\textbf{Bulow Plantation}

In 1821, Charles Wilhelm Bulow, a wealthy South Carolinian, bought 4,675 acres on the Halifax River and established the plantation known as “Bulowville.” The plantation included 800 cultivated acres, a steam-powered sugar mill, extensive rice fields and numerous industrial
and domestic structures (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:3). Hundreds of slaves produced sugar, corn, and sea-island cotton at Bulowville and the plantation was known as “one of the finest in Florida” (Williams 1837:139). Charles did not live long enough to see his plantation prosper, however. He passed away just two years after his arrival, leaving his estate to his teenage son, John Joachim Bulow. John Bulow was noted for his unruly nature and his excessive cruelty. In fact, the little that is known historically about Africans and African-Americans at the plantation is derived from tales of Bulow’s brutality (Davidson et. al 2015). Fortunately, Bulowville did not last long; the majority of the plantation was burned at the outset of the Second Seminole War in January of 1836, just fourteen years after it was established.

At the start of the war, despite John Bulow’s protests, and his attacks on the approaching troops, Major Putnam garrisoned a number of U.S. soldiers and volunteer militia at the plantation (Davidson and Ibarrola 2106:5; Wilson 1945:236). The soldiers evacuated the residents by barge to St. Augustine and used cotton bales and cabbage palm construction to fortify the plantation (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:7). According to accounts by Brigadier General Joseph Hernández, and other officers, the soldiers took up residence in the slave quarters during the period of occupation. The troops were removed from the plantation on January 23rd, 1836 and the plantation was burned over the course of the next few weeks. John Bulow died several months later and the plantation was never rebuilt (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016).

In a claim made with the U.S. government following the destruction of Bulowville, the plantation overseer, Francis Pellicer, stated that the Seminole kidnapped four African slaves. According to the record submitted to the U.S. Senate, Pellicer noted that “… the Indians got possession of four prime negroes, named George, July, Scipio, and Abraham” (U.S. Senate 1839a: claim 129, page 11). Given the ongoing slave rebellion and the participation of Maroon
forces in the attacks on Central and East Florida plantations, it may be possible that these men were not captured but instead joined the fight.

Today, Bulow Plantation is part of the state park system of Florida. Located in Flagler County, near the town of Bunnell, the property, including the ruins of the sugar mill and other structures, was acquired by the State of Florida in 1945 (Division of Recreation and Parks 1998:1) and dedicated as a State Historic Park in 1957. The site was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1970. A number of archaeological surveys and excavations have been conducted at the plantation since its acquisition by the state, however, until recently, all subsurface excavation at the site has been conducted at the main house or sugar mill (Griffin 1952; Gluckman and Baker 1967; Daniel et al 1980; Fairbanks 1983:22; Baker 1991; Baker 1999). The first excavations at Bulowville were conducted in the 1950s, when John Griffin excavated at the site with the purpose of documenting the architecture of the main house (Griffin 1952). In the 1960s, Charles Fairbanks, visited the site in order to document prehistoric sites and the ruins of the sugar mill. However, he also conducted a limited survey of the slave cabins, mapping but not disturbing the structures (Fairbanks 1983:22-23; Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:1).

More recently, attention has focused exclusively on the sites’ many slave cabins. In 2011, a team from the University of South Florida used a combination of LIDAR and metal detecting to map the cabins, refining the location of the semi-complete arc of structures around the main house. The results of their survey are available both as a technical report (Collins et al. 2012) and as a master’s thesis through USF (O’Sullivan 2012). In the 2014, 2015, and 2016 field seasons, utilizing the results of the LIDAR survey, the University of Florida conducted excavations focused on two domestic slave cabins and the surrounding yard (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016). The UF fieldwork was designed by professor James M. Davidson as a
continuation of nearly a decade of work done by UF fieldschools at Kingsley Plantation in Duval County, and as a comparison for that site (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:1-2). Overall, materials collected were domestic in nature and included primarily architectural materials, glass, and ceramics.

University of Florida excavations originally focused on Cabin 1, the northeasternmost cabin in the arc. The 2014 and 2015 seasons and about half of the 2016 season were dedicated to excavating the complete Cabin 1 footprint and extensive testing in the yard. In 2014 and 2015, forty-six units were excavated at Cabin 1, forty in the cabin footprint and six in the yard. A total of fourteen features were recorded and soil samples were collected as appropriate. Another eight yard units were excavated at Cabin 1 in 2016. All soil was screened using 1/8” mesh and large blocks of coquina from the cabin chimney were measured and weighed on site. The second half of the 2016 season was dedicated to excavation at Cabin 3, a cabin two positions southwest from Cabin 1 on the arc. This thesis relies almost exclusively on data collected from Cabin 1 in the 2014 and 2015 seasons, the only exceptions being the spindle whorl recovered from Cabin 3, a single post documented to the east of that cabin, a door pintle recovered from Cabin 1 in 2016, and a number of beads recovered from Cabin 1 in 2016. All analysis was done by the author and fellow graduate students David Markus and Brett Mogenson at the University of Florida, and compiled by the author and James M. Davidson.
Despite their disastrous arrival in Florida, many Minorcans, like Martin Hernández, eventually found great economic success. Hernández was just one of many new Florida residents taking advantage of policies designed to draw people and capital into St. Augustine and the greater East Florida territory. In 1790, the Spanish Crown granted Hernández, at the time the city’s chief carpenter, roughly ten acres of land at the edge of the city proper (Griffin 1991:155). Hernández established an orange grove on one half of the property and corn was planted on the other half. In October 1815, after twenty-five years of improvement to the land, the city of St. Augustine officially granted Hernández the deed to the property (Beck 2006). However, Martin Hernández left Florida for Cuba just two years later, leaving his son Joseph in control of the
orange grove and other properties. Unlike his father the carpenter, Joseph was a lawyer and a politician, and served as a delegate to Florida’s first Legislative Council and as a Florida delegate in the US Congress (Linville 2004:12). The younger Hernández was also made head commander of the East Florida militia in the Second Seminole War and was responsible for the protection of all East Florida citizens (Beck 2006:50; Linville 2004:20), including the slaves living on his father’s orange grove.

Citriculture first appeared in Florida in the First Spanish Period when orange trees were an integral part of the kitchen garden. The earliest archaeological evidence of citrus in Florida comes from St. Augustine, where the remains of an orange, discarded in a well, dating to the mid-17th century were recovered. However, documentary record pushes the appearance of oranges in Florida back nearly one hundred years to 1579 (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:2). By the early 18th century when Hernández received the land, oranges were a valuable cash crop, exported to English colonial ports (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:2).

A number of small buildings were also constructed on the property. These buildings were home to a handful of enslaved individuals who managed the small plantation. While no record definitively identifies the occupants of the buildings as slaves, there are records demonstrating that similar groves in St. Augustine were being cared for by slaves (Zierden 1981:37) and that Hernández owned seven slaves (Mills 1992:79). Furthermore, when the land was sold in 1833, the sale included “sundry negroes” (St. Johns Co. deed records, Vol I-J:43-45).

After Joseph Hernández sold the orange grove, it changed hands several times in succession until 1887 when it was razed by the St. Augustine Improvement Company. The land sat empty until the 1950s when the city divided it into smaller plots and became part of Lincolnville, a prominent African-American community (Beck 2006). In 2004, modern
development reached the site of the former orange grove. As the site is located within the archaeological zone designated by the City of St. Augustine’s Archaeological Preservation Ordinance, adopted in 1986, an archaeological survey of the property was required before any ground-penetrating activity associated with the planned construction of a single family home could go forward (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:5).

Excavation began in June 2004. City archaeologist Carl Halbirt and volunteers conducted an auger survey and placed test units across the site according to quantity and diversity of artifacts recovered in the survey (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:5). Survey and subsurface testing revealed that the north third of the lot contained potentially significant deposits and excavation efforts were refocused on that area (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:5). Approximately 8,000 artifacts were recovered and nine features were documented (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:6). Excavation yielded items primarily domestic in nature including clay pipes, glass, nails, faunal remains, and the outline of a two-room structure. Additionally, construction activities were monitored and spoil piles were examined both visually and with a metal detector (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:6).

Soon after the conclusion of excavation, the site was the focus of a master’s thesis by Rita Beck (2006) at Florida State University. Beck (2006) evaluates both historical documentation and the archaeological record in order to validate the claim that the site’s inhabitants were indeed slaves. Although it is typically difficult to analyze urban slave sites archaeologically, as masters and slaves lived in relatively close quarters within cities and discarded their trash in the same places (Zierdan 1999), 71 Park Place was occupied exclusively by slaves. Hernández and his family lived in the center of town, a short walk away from the plantation, but their trash should not be mixed with the remains of slave life at the site. While a
number of post-19th century deposits were recovered from the site, only those deposits identified by Halbirt and Beck as directly related to the early 19th century occupation of the site are considered here (Beck 2006; Hagen and Halbirt 2005).

Figure 4-3. Local coverage of the excavations at 71 Park Place. Photo by Peter Guinta, April 11 2005, St. Augustine: The St. Augustine Record.

**Organization of Analysis**

Stanley South, in his 1977 book, *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*, urged archaeologists to look for patterns in the archaeological record, and to apply those patterns to their interpretations of the past. He argued that by recognizing patterns in the material world archaeologists could recognize patterns in human behavior. South particularly emphasized the importance of quantification, which he saw as key to identifying material patterns (South
1977:85) and preferable to a particularistic approach, in which each artifact is considered separately and the assemblage is never considered as a whole (South 1977:31).

South demonstrated his proposal with the Carolina Artifact Pattern. He devised the pattern for the analysis of British colonial sites, on the premise that a British family in the Americas could be expected to have certain things and act in certain ways, regardless of the particularities of their environment (South 1977:86-87). Based on the artifacts recovered from five 18th century British colonial sites in North and South Carolina, South defined eight distinct artifact groups – kitchen, architecture, furniture, arms, clothing, personal, tobacco, and activities – and defined a range of variation for the percentage of artifacts present in each artifact group (South 1977:95-110). If a site were unusual in some way, the archaeologist would be alerted to the difference by an unusual ratio of artifacts. South’s pattern was admittedly limited and produced a simplistic, functional understanding of material culture. However, in the years following the release of *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology* archaeologists developed a number of new artifact patterns. Theresa Singleton, as part of her dissertation work, created a slave artifact pattern for coastal Georgia and Florida (1980). Patterns were also created for the Georgia planter and South Carolina planter and slave (Joseph 1989:58).

Although the following investigation does not attempt to compare sites using a defined percentage system, an artifact classification system is used to structure analysis. The artifact classification system utilized in the following analysis is based on the system used by James Davidson in his work at Kingsley and Bulow Plantations (Davidson 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2013; Davidson et al. 2015; Davidson and Ibarrola 2016), and which he modeled on Charles Orser’s analysis of 19th and 20th century assemblages from Millwood, an antebellum plantation located near Columbia, South Carolina (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:30). Notably, the
categorization of artifacts in an artifact pattern or classification system is based on assumed function and implied behavior (Orser 1988:233), which may not represent actual use. However, the purpose of the artifact pattern in this analysis is not to propose or assume that Maroons or enslaved people acted in particular patterned or defined ways. Instead, it is used to compare and contrast the three groups. The sites are not compared to a standard; instead, they are compared to each other. The classification system is admittedly etic, but serves as a starting point for an etic discussion of Maroon and slave lives.

The following categories provide the primary structure for analysis: architecture and space, ceramics, floral and faunal materials, and personal artifacts. The first category, architecture and space, incorporates architectural artifacts, such as coquina and nails; architectural features, such as posts or stains; and the concept of landscape. The ceramics category consists of all ceramic sherds, from St. John’s pottery to Chinese porcelain. Although South uses the ‘kitchen’ category and Davidson and Orser use the ‘household’ category, glass has been excluded from this analysis due to time constraints and lack of technical knowledge on the part of the author. The floral and faunal category includes zoological remains and floral materials as related to agriculture and consumption; this includes animal bone, eggshell, and seeds. Invertebrates have not been analyzed at any of the three sites and are not included in analysis. ‘Personal artifacts’ is the most inclusive category and encompasses any item intended for use by an individual. This includes clothing-related items such as buttons and buckles, objects for personal adornment like earrings and beads, firearms and ammunition, and tobacco pipes.
CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS

Architecture

Material Evidence

Historical sources provide a good starting point for analysis of architecture at Peliklikaha. A lithograph depicting the site’s destruction, created shortly after the event, portrays a chaotic scene. In the foreground are two small groups of soldiers and a mounted rider driving cattle, in the background four human figures with horses approach a rise on which sit ten or more small buildings, engulfed in flames. The buildings appear to be log or wooden plank-sided cabins of various sizes however their exact arrangement and spacing is unclear in the print. The print highlights the site’s isolated position atop a small hill and fine black lines seem to suggest the existence of a fence or other barricade at the base of the hill. Military accounts from the era confirm the existence of a fence that ringed the settlement (Sprague 1848) and note that the houses at Peliklikaha were bigger than those of their Seminole neighbors (McCall 1974[1868]).

Unfortunately, material evidence of the many historically documented structures was scarce. Archaeological survey confirmed the site’s location on a hill; however, subsurface investigations at the site identified only a handful of artifacts and features related to the 19th century structures and their arrangement. A total of 71 brick fragments and 27 nails were recovered, representing less than 4% of the total assemblage (Weik 2002:114). The brick fragments are likely representative of brick chimneys or pier foundations, and the low number of recovered nails suggest that the cabins were more likely log construction than wooden framed. However, one feature, a thin charcoal stain, just 1cm in depth, containing a sand tempered coarse earthenware sherd, was identified as a post hole given its contents and proximity to a number of iron nails (Weik 2002:131-132) and three other postholes were readily identified (given their
dark soil color, defined boundaries, proximity to one another and other artifacts, and high charcoal content) (Weik 2002:133). These post-holes suggest that the cabins may have alternatively been earthfast constructions. Additionally, an unidentifiable ashy white stain and a larger, shallow, charcoal lens, overlaid with green glass and metal fragments may represent the results of some construction event and a cabin floor, respectively (Weik 2002:134-135).

The arrangement of these features, along with artifact distribution patterns, suggests that the town of Peliklikaha had an asymmetrical, non-geometric layout resembling an L or a rough triangle (Weik 2002:140, 169). Although more fieldwork on the western half of the site is necessary to fully encompass the settlement, site topography suggests that the site does not extend much further in any direction, as the hill drops off dramatically in all directions with wetlands beyond (Weik 2002:141).

Figure 5-1. "The Burning of the Town Pilk-li-ka-ha by Gen. Eustis," lithograph by J.F. Gray, Charleston Mercury, July 11 1836.
Architectural materials were more prevalent at Bulow Plantation. Cabins 1 and 3 are located at the northeastern end of an arc of structures facing Bulow Creek, with the main house located at the center of the arc, near the creek. The cabins were first identified by the presence of coquina blocks on the surface. At Cabin 1, the mound of coquina was later found to be the remains of the cabin’s fallen chimney and the lining of a sub-floor pit. Excavation at the cabin produced dressed coquina blocks, as well as coquina fragments, mortar, burned plank board fragments, cut nails, a single red clay brick bat, and a door pintle (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:36). Some 2,246 nails and nail fragments, including 183 intact, machine cut nails were recovered (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:36). The high number of nails and predominance of a single nail size, 6d, suggests that the cabin was a framed structure rather than a log construction.
A number of burnt wooden planks were also documented in-situ and a thin charcoal layer was noted throughout the projected cabin footprint. This matches the historical descriptions of the cabins, which come from claims made by the owner, his heirs, and the plantation overseer following the Second Seminole War, which describe the cabins as being of frame construction with shingle roofs and approximately 12 by 16 feet in size (U.S. Senate 1839a: claim 129, page 4, 11).

Over 821.498 kg of coquina, or 1,811 pounds (almost one ton) of stone was removed. This total does not include the chimney base and subfloor pit lining, which were left in-situ for the purpose of reconstruction and site interpretation. The subfloor pit, which abutted the chimney base, measured 1.6 meters by 1.85 meters and like the cabin had a north/south alignment. The northern wall of the sub-floor pit was either built of a perishable material or removed erroneously with the chimney fall, and the intact walls reveal differential construction methods. While the western wall of the pit was constructed of formal cut and mortared blocks with a crushed coquina foundation and the south wall, shared with the chimney base, was constructed similarly of cut coquina blocks but lacking a skirt, the east wall of the pit is composed of large, mushroom shaped stones, similar to the naturally eroded outcroppings of a coquina deposit (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:142-143).

While excavation on Cabin 3 has yet to reveal the presence of a sub-floor pit, excavation to this point suggests that the structure, like Cabin 1 is a small wood-framed cabin with a coquina block chimney. In addition, the presence of a single post off the east side of the cabin may represent a porch, but requires further research.

Construction materials were less common at 71 Park Place than at Bulow Plantation, but represented a greater proportion of the assemblage than at Peliklikaha. A total of 402
architecture related artifacts were recovered, representing over twenty-four percent of the total assemblage (Beck 2006:44). These artifacts included 262 nails and nail fragments, including seventy machine cut nails and 6 hand wrought nails, 13.5 grams of coquina, flat glass fragments, three iron spikes, and a broken pintle (Beck 2006:43-44). The coquina, although a common construction material in the St. Augustine area, is likely unrelated to the primary structure at the site given the low amount recovered (Beck 2006:44). Additionally, although the flat glass has been identified as potential window fragments in previous analysis (Beck 2006:43), the researcher was unable to access these particular fragments for closer analysis and they will be excluded from further discussion. Five historic features were revealed in excavation including a series of postholes outlining what appears to be an 8 by 5 meter two-room wattle and daub structure (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:9), a barrel shaft well in the southeastern corner of the structure (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:9), and two possible root cellars or storage pits just outside the southwestern corner of the structure (Beck 2006:18).

However, unlike at Bulow, the potential cabin does not appear to be part of a larger plantation infrastructure. The structure sits on the northeastern most corner of the grove property and although a number of later deposits were identified across the area surveyed, these features represent the lone 19th century structure present on the property. According to historical maps, the cabin would have been relatively isolated but still within walking distance of the city center.

While all three sites produced architectural materials appropriate for the time period and consistent with documentary records, they vary significantly, both in their construction methods and the position of their structures within a wider landscape. The town of Peliklikaha consisted of an indistinct cluster of log or earthfast cabins in a relatively inaccessible but easily defensible location. Cabin 1 at Bulowville was a wood-framed cabin, with wood plank floors, a sub-floor
pit, and a coquina chimney located within a formally structured plantation environment. The earthenfast wattle and daub cabin equipped with both storage pits and a well at 71 Park Place existed in relative isolation at the edge of a city. Architectural materials and features at these three sites represent both the variety of cultural influences present in 19th century Florida and the reality of frontier life.

**The Plantation Pattern**

Archaeologists have identified a set of characteristics shared by most plantation housing in the Southeast. According to the model, on Southeastern plantations, slaves’ cabins, in European style (Singleton 1998:179), were typically arranged in rigid rows or blocks, which followed a European concept of spatial order established by the planter (Joyner 2003; Delle 1998; Epperson 1999a; Fairbanks 1978; Joyner 1984 & 2003; Vlach 1993; Weik 2002). Excluded from the formal landscape, which was structured around the presentation of the main house, slave quarters were instead arranged as to facilitate the surveillance of slaves’ activities by their masters (Singleton 1998:179) or with the purpose of hiding slaves from the visitor’s perspective (Epperson 1999). The structures were single, double, or multifamily cabins constructed using tabby, clapboard, or brick (Vlach 1993; Weik 2002). Additionally, in archaeological analysis of plantation sites, architecture is typically the most represented artifact group (Babson 1988; Fairbanks 1972; Singleton 1980; South 1977).

According to historian Larry Eugene Rivers (Rivers 2000), plantation housing in Florida was generally in line with regional patterns; slave cabins were typically one-room wooden structures arranged in rows. Accounts from the early years of statehood suggest that Florida’s plantation housing was much like that in the rest of the nation: Mary Biddle, a former slave described her living quarters as “a large one-room house built in the yard” and John Finlayson, a
planter in Middle Florida who had over 180 slaves, established rows of one-room cabins, constructed with “whole logs notched together at the corners, with pine straw and mud to close the cracks” (Rivers 2000:134). Rivers asserts that despite the relative advantage of living in a semi-tropical climate, “slaves shivered in the winter and endured searing heat in the summer… roofs leaked, and pests of all sorts found easy access” (Rivers 2000:134).

Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation most closely fits the model established for southeastern plantation housing. The high concentration of nails, in particular nails of the same size, the presence of burned wooden planks, and corroborating documentary evidence suggest the structure was a wood framed, European style structure (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016). The cabin is also part of a highly organized plantation landscape and although “fireplaces in the early territorial period usually amounted only to dried mud and sticks…” (Rivers 2000:134), the use of coquina was not uncommon in East Florida and was readily available within the Bulow estate. However, the arc-like arrangement of the cabins at Bulowville breaks with the linear or block like layout typical on Southeastern plantations and may suggest the influence of African social organization on East Florida plantations.

In claims submitted to the federal government after the Second Seminole War, John Joachim Bulow and his heirs note the existence of up to 46 slave cabins (US Senate 1839a: Public Document No. 129, page 11) on the plantation. While survey at the site has yet to identity this many structures (O’Sullivan 2012:87), a clear semi-circular arrangement of buildings has been detected and confirmed by ground-penetrating radar (O’Sullivan 2012, Davidson and Ibarrola 2016). Nonetheless, if slave cabins were typically arranged in blocks or rows in order to further confine slaves within the plantation landscape and promote easy surveillance, the reason for arranging the cabins in an arc remains unclear.
Whatever the reason, it is likely that Bulow borrowed the arrangement from Zephaniah Kingsley, whose plantation on Fort George Island, built about five years prior to the construction of Bulow Plantation, featured thirty-two tabby cabins, aligned in a highly symmetrical semi-circle, with a central avenue running through the middle of the arc (Davidson 2007). While the arc of cabins at Bulow Plantation is not as neatly aligned as that at Kingsley (O’Sullivan 2012), both semi-circular arrangements face a river and encircle the main house. Scholars have suggested that when Kingsley Plantation was active, and the land was clear of trees, the arc-like organization of slave cabins would have made practical sense; the arrangement would have made the surveillance of slave homes and activities easier for the plantation owner, provided greater privacy for families as compared to a block arrangement (Schafer 2003:54-56; Stowell 1996:73), and enabled better defense of the plantation by essentially creating thirty-two sentry posts around the main house (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:130).

However, it has also been suggested that Kingsley’s Senegalese wife Anta Madgigine Jai or Anna Kingsley, a former slave, may have influenced the site layout and had cultural rather than practical priorities. Madgigine Jai, freed by Kingsley three years before their move to Fort George Island in 1814, was the plantation manager, and may have designed the arc with African village forms in mind (Meek 1931:319). Brown and Rivers (2014), argue that she “reconstructed a semicircular West African village reminiscent of scenes from her youth to serve as the plantation’s slave quarters” (Brown and Rivers 2014:176).

This semi-circular arrangement of slave cabins has also been observed at Yaughan Plantation, an indigo and rice estate owned by French Huguenots in Berkeley County, South Carolina (Wheaton and Garrow 1985:242). In operation from the 1740s through the 1790s, Yaughan is considered part of the Lowcountry, a region of coastal Georgia and South Carolina
where the majority African population developed the unique Gullah culture and language, an English Creole with African loan words and grammar. West African cultural influence is evident in the ceramic assemblage at Yaughan, by far the most abundant ceramic type at the site is colonoware (Wheaton and Garrow 1985:248) and it is possible that this same influence is visible in the site’s social organization as well. The earlier of the two slave housing arrangements at Yaughan, “occupied at a time when Euro-American influence on the plantation was minimal” (Wheaton and Garrow 1985:243), consists of thirteen earthen-walled structures arranged in an open arc (Wheaton and Garrow 1985:247-248). Given the early date of the settlement, its location with South Carolina lowcountry, and the lack of Euro-American management, the likelihood of West African cultural influence on the site’s architecture is high.

Table 2-1. Arrangement of slave quarters at southeastern plantations (Weik 2002:146)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location and Date</th>
<th>Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley</td>
<td>FL, 1813-1843</td>
<td>Arc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Hill</td>
<td>SC, 19th Century</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulowville</td>
<td>FL 1821-1836</td>
<td>Arc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaughan 38BK75</td>
<td>SC, 1740-1820</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaughan 38BK76</td>
<td>SC, 1740-1820</td>
<td>Arc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Island #4</td>
<td>GA, 1799-1861</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon’s Point (north)</td>
<td>GA, 1794-1861</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon’s Point (south)</td>
<td>GA, 1794-1861</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Creek</td>
<td>GA, 1801-1811</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Bay</td>
<td>GA, 1791-1813</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5-3. Slave quarters at Yaughan Plantation (38BK76), South Carolina. Digital Archaeology Archive of Comparative Slavery.
Figure 5-4. Stereoview of slave cabin ruins, Kingsley Plantation, Ft. George Island, from McIlvoy (2013).

It may be that a semi-circular arrangement was simply a way for plantation owners to oversee their slaves more closely, however, given Zephaniah Kingsley’s Afrocentric reputation and generally relaxed attitude as a slave-owner, it is unlikely that supervision was his primary reasoning for the arrangement and at Yaughan Plantation this pattern emerged out of sight of Euro-American supervision. While John Bulow was certainly a sadistic master, it is unlikely that he had a hand in the construction of the plantation infrastructure as he was living in France at the
time of the site’s establishment and although his father Charles may have had greater input, Francisco Pellicer, the overseer, was most likely responsible for the use of the semi-circle arrangement. Pellicer, who grew up in St. Augustine, the child of Minorcan immigrants, may have been more open to or conscious of the alternative plantation design. It may also be that Kingsley, having had one plantation destroyed by enemy Seminole forces already, and Pellicer, having witnessed the political turmoil of late 18th century Florida, were both conscious of the possibility of violence on the frontier. The men may have been preparing for violent military encounters with a defensive, fort-like arrangement (Davidson 2006:41-42). However, if Anna Madgigine Jai Kingsley was indeed responsible for the semi-circular arrangement of cabins at Kingsley plantation, the reach of her cultural memory is impressive. She inserted a Wolof form of social organization, remembered from her youth, into the plantation landscape and that arrangement was then adopted by another nearby plantation, regardless of whether the planters and overseers at that site were conscious of it’s cultural significance.

African architectural forms and concepts of social organization most likely impacted Peliklikaha as well, although in a more democratic way. British occupation of Florida brought a new wave of Africans to the peninsula as well as their indigenous African concepts of kinship and symbolism, which likely impacted Maroon site layout (Fletcher 1977; Schmidt 1997; Weik 2002). Besides the Senegambian pattern which individuals like Anna Kingsley may have remembered, Agorsah (1985) describes a Ghanaian pattern, which persisted throughout the era of the Atlantic slave trade, of ten houses or less grouped around a central open space. Of course, African patterns of social organization varied throughout the continent, and even the Ghanaian plan, described by Agorsah, varied from the interior to the coast (Weik 2002). However, in general, family based compounds were widely used in Africa in ancient times and persist in
some rural areas to the present (Aniakor 1996; Weik 2002). Unlike most Maroon communities, the Florida Maroons had strong family structures from the beginning as Spanish laws allowed free black society to prosper and later British protections allowed for the escape of entire families from West Florida (Landers 2014). Maroon families, extended by the fictive kin relationships established over the course of their flight, may have settled Peliklikaha together, and the rough triangle or L shape identified at Peliklikaha could reflect this kind of family based arrangement; an open area, surrounded by nine or ten structures, occupied by a family-based social group.

However, Seminole influence might have resulted in a similar pattern. Seminole settlements of the period ranged from traditional “square-ground” forms inherited from the Creek, to dispersed homesteads (Fairbanks 1978; Weik 2002; Weisman 1989). Homesteads, the more common arrangement by the 19th century, consisted of just two or three buildings occupied by a single matrilineal family (Weisman 1989) while the square-ground was a larger town with a central plaza surrounded by public structures and kin-based clusters of three or four buildings arranged in smaller, adjacent squares (Weik 2002). While the presence of domestic materials throughout the site does not support the possibility of a square-ground arrangement with public buildings, the features and artifacts recovered may represent a modified square-ground arrangement.

Maroon systems of governance lend strength to the possibility that Peliklikaha and other Maroon settlements in Florida are organized on the Seminole square-ground system. Before 1700, most Maroons leaders across the Americas were African born, their governing systems modeled on African systems of governance; Maroon leaders held power based on descent or spiritual knowledge. By the 18th century however, most Maroon leaders were born in the
Americas and although familiar with African customs, preferred military titles (Katz 1986:43). Although Florida’s Maroon population saw an influx of African born people in the late 18th century, their militarized lifestyle may suggest that a military based system of governance existed in Florida as well. Every Black Seminole village was aligned with a Seminole chief, and the nearby Seminole village of Powell’s Town, led by chief Micanopy, was a square ground settlement (Weisman 1989:144-147). Although Black Seminole villages maintained virtual autonomy and selected their own leaders (Howard 2014:111), the military alliance with Powell’s Town and Micanopy may have resulted in the use of an altered Seminole settlement pattern.

Ultimately, it may be difficult to discern archaeologically between a modified square-ground pattern and a generic African family-based social arrangement. It should also be noted that Maroons had been exposed to European colonial spatial organization as well; including towns like St. Augustine with a rectilinear layout, centered around religious or administrative buildings (Deagan 1996) and linear plantation slave housing. However, it is clear that Peliklikaha featured a site layout that differed from the family-homestead arrangement of most Seminoles Indians and the linear plantation slave villages of the southeastern United States (Weik 2002:140).

**Cabin Construction**

Cabin construction at Peliklikaha may also be representative of cultural transformation. As noted above, archaeological evidence suggests that the structures at Peliklikaha were either log cabins or earthfast structures, with brick chimneys. If the illustration of Peliklikaha from *Burning of the Town Pilak-li-ka-ha by Gen. Eustis* is assumed to be an accurate depiction, the homes were more likely log cabin constructions. Maroon use of log cabins also makes sense given their use by their close allies; the first Seminoles to settle in North Florida built log-cabin type homes, a form adapted by the Muscogee from Northern European immigrants; cabins were
one or two stories tall with sleeping quarters on the second level (MacCauley 2000[1887]). Many African Americans in the southern British colonies also willingly adopted European log construction and roof planking. One Southern planter noted that log cabins had an advantage over wood framed and boarded cabins as well, being cooler in the winter and warmer in the summer (Breeden 1980:125) and archaeologist Leland Ferguson argues that the log cabins would have survived wet Southern winters better than clay or earthfast homes (Ferguson 1992:81).

Although Black Seminoles may have later built and lived in chickees, archaeological and documentary evidence suggests that they were not utilized at Peliklikaha. The chickee, an open sided structure built out of cypress logs and palmetto thatch, eventually replaced the log cabin during the Indian Wars (MacCauley 2000[1887]; Weik 2002) as chickees were easy to construct and lasted about ten years; much longer than the Seminole could expect to spend at any one site. However, the presence of brick fragments is incongruous with the use of chickees, which did not have attached chimneys, and the lithograph illustration clearly depicts solid walled structures. Additionally, Hugh Young, a topographical engineer assigned to assist Andrew Jackson’s army during the First Seminole War, visited a Suwannee Maroon town and noted that the Maroons’ “cabins were large and better constructed than those of the Indians” (Young 1953[1818]:100). If the structures had been chickees, Young likely would have used that term specifically, but he refers specifically to cabins. Peliklikaha was the longest-lived Maroon settlement in Florida and the use of log cabins at the Suwannee Maroon site, where a number of Peliklikaha’s residents may have lived prior to the town’s establishment, suggests that the inhabitants of Peliklikaha would likely have exhausted the time and resources, and had the knowledge and skill set necessary, to build log-cabins.
Nonetheless, artistic inaccuracies should not be ruled out and the construction of earthfast housing by Maroons is also within the realm of possibility, especially given the identification of several post-holes at the site. Many slaves brought knowledge of West African style mud-walled houses to the Americas and applied those skills in building their new homes. Although the very first enslaved Africans in the contemporary United States likely lived in their masters’ homes, around 1660 there was a shift to separate housing and African Americans built African style earthfast housing (Deetz 1988:239). Over time, an architectural shift took place and these earthen houses were replaced by European style log cabins or wood-framed houses (Wheaton and Garrow 1985:248). By 1800 “African American houses appear to have evolved from African-style structures to houses with some European features; nevertheless, dwellings
continued to be small with most activities taking place in the yard – distinctive West African traits” (Ferguson 1992:75).

However, it may be that slaves preferred earthen structures and the transition was more reflective of planters’ purposes than slaves’ preference or comfort. While early planters and overseers likely appreciated and encouraged African architectural skills, “in their efforts to dominate slaves and appease abolitionists, some nineteenth-century planters tried to erase African features, making their plantations conform to an “anglo” ideal” (Ferguson 1992:75-77).

According to ex-slave Charles Ball, “the native Africans… generally place[d] little or even no value upon the fine houses… of their masters” (Lester 1968:87). Thatched and clay-walled houses could be built quickly with readily available materials and they were easily rebuilt. They were also good for hot climates as “earthen floors, thick insulating walls, and dark enclosed rooms trap the cook night air and guard against the penetrating midday sun” (Ferguson 1992:72).

However, the interests of slaves and planters were different. In an 1822 response to an abolitionist publication, Robert Turnbull (as quoted in Ferguson 1992:79), a wealthy planter, wrote about Lowcountry plantation housing:

> their dwellings consist of good clay cabins, with clay chimneys, but so much attention has been paid of late years to their comfort in this particular, that it is now very common, particularly on the Sea Islands, to give them substantial frame houses on brick foundations and with brick chimneys. Many are of opinion that they enjoy more health in open temporary cabins with ground or dirt floors. But this does not correspond with the experience of those who willingly incur the expense of better buildings.

Planters, those concerned about image and able to afford building materials, constructed wood-framed cabins for their own interests, not their slaves’.

As noted above, Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation was likely a wood-framed structure with wooden siding and shingles (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016). Although the management structure at Bulowville in the early years is unclear, the substantial resources available to build plantation
infrastructure is evident. Charles Bulow came from a wealthy planting family and expended considerable funds to build the massive sugar processing facility that still stands at the site today. Slave housing at Bulow is more likely representative of the Bulow family’s wealth than the enslaved individuals desires, architectural skills, or even relationship with the master and overseer.

It is possible that given the autonomy, the slaves at Bulowville would have chosen to build earthen-walled homes rather than the wood cabins dictated by their master and the documentary record suggests there was some variation in plantation housing in 19th century East Florida. Contemporary housing at the St. Joseph Plantation, owned by Joseph Hernández and located just south of Bulowville, was described by a U.S. army lieutenant as “made entirely out of palmetto leaves, thatched from top to bottom, [with] only one small aperture to crawl in by” (Smith 1836:158-159). At Fort McCrae, slave cabins had palmetto-thatched roofs (Strickland 1980:23), and according to William Ladd, a ship captain and plantation owner turned abolitionist, in early 19th century Florida,

the dwellings of the slaves were palmetto huts, built by themselves of stakes and poles, thatched with the palmetto leaf. The door, when they had any, was generally of the same materials, sometimes boards found on the beach. They had no floors, no separate apartments, except the guinea negroes had sometimes a small inclosure for their ‘god house.’ These huts the slaves built themselves after task and on Sundays” (Weld 1839:43).

However, it is impossible to discern from these records whether palmetto construction was a matter of choice for these slaves or necessity. Huts built entirely out of palmetto would not have had the same advantages afforded by clay or mud-walled structures and it is unclear whether palmetto homes are representative of autonomy over housing or simply deprivation.

The construction of an earthfast structure at 71 Park Place may have had more to do with local architectural traditions than direct African influence or slave preferences (Beck 2006;
Hagen and Halbirt 2005). Architectural historian Alfred Manucy (1978) notes that although wood post structures, built entirely out of upright wooden posts, disappeared from St. Augustine’s architectural vocabulary in the 17th century (Manucy 1978:62), post-in-ground construction, in which a wooden post frame supported a mud surface, was common in the colonial town. Post-wall construction was particularly popular in conjunction with the wattle-and-daub method and utilized locally available materials (Manucy 1978:66). When building a wall or fence, cypress posts were placed in post-holes and the spaces in-between them were filled with ‘wattle’-woven sticks, twings, and branches. The wooden structure was then coated in mud or ‘daub’ on both sides, with clay coming from sources just South of the city, and whitewashed (Manucy 1978:64, 78; 1997).

Post-in-ground or post-wall construction had been used in Florida since pre-Columbian times (Manucy 1978:64) and its persistence in St. Augustine may have come from the Spanish colonists willingness to adopt local practices. The Spanish also utilized predominantly locally produced ceramics, as will be discussed in the following section, and relied heavily on local sources of meat, particularly fish. However, by the 19th century, earthfast construction had largely been replaced by masonry using coquina, a sedimentary rock composed entirely of crushed shells. Called ‘piedra’ or stone by the Spanish, coquina came from quarries accessible by boat and was used in conjunction with wood framing and siding or on its own (Manucy 1978:67). The use of wattle-and-daub technology and a post-in-ground foundation would have been fairly unusual for the Late Second Spanish or Territorial era.

The slaves living at 71 Park Place were also not necessarily responsible for the construction of the cabin there. Many Minorcan immigrants, including Martin Hernández, were skilled craftsmen, and at the time of the land grant Hernández was the city’s chief architect.
While slaves were primarily responsible for construction in other parts of the state and throughout the Atlantic world, many of the builders in St. Augustine were free men from the Mediterranean (Manucy 1978:44).

Nonetheless, slaves typically constructed their own homes and the widespread use of porches in the Southern United States is a testament to the influence of African architecture in the region. Porches were rare in 17th and 18th century England and folklorist John Vlach has suggested that the American porch has African roots (Ferguson 1992:57). Slave quarters like those at Kingsmill Plantation, which are European in basic design but have been “changed and used in ways that suited African styles of living” (Ferguson 1992:57), like adding porches and outdoor kitchens, highlight the ways that Africans in the Americas adapted and transformed their material world. At both 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation’s Cabin 3, isolated posts suggest the presence of porches. At 71 Park Place, the presence of a single post, aligned with the south
wall, suggests that the cabin may have had a porch along the west wall, facing the orange grove (Hagen and Halbirt 2005:6). At Cabin 3, a single post juts out from the east side of the cabin and may have once been part of a porch looking out on the river.

**Subfloor Pits**

Slaves’ ownership over their homes may also be evidenced by the presence of storage pits at both the cabin at 71 Park Place and Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation. At the Hernández orange grove, the two pits are located just outside of the cabin on southwest corner. One, measured six feet in diameter but only sixteen inches deep. The other, smaller, squarish pit, measured approximately four and half feet on each side and sixteen inches deep. Both pits contained a variety of artifacts, suggesting their use as refuse dumps, however, the smaller pit also contained an 1803 half *real*.

The sub-floor pit in Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation measures approximately 5.25 by 6 feet and is oriented on a north/south axis, just as the cabin above. The west wall of the pit was constructed using fine ashlar masonry with a formal skirt foundation while the east wall utilizes large mushroom shaped stones, likely the natural surfaces of coquina outcrops, and has no foundation (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:142). Besides a few nails and charcoal fragments suggestive of a wooden frame lining (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016) the pit is empty.

It has been suggested that subfloor pits are manifestations of African culture and social practice, with historical links to a number of African cultures (Kelso 1984:105). Subfloor pits associated with African housing have been well documented archaeologically in Maryland, Virginia, and the Upland South from the 17th through the 19th centuries (Kimmel 1993; Neuwirth 1996; Young 1997; Fesler 2004; Samford 2007; Neiman 2008; Cohen 2008). In Virginia, Patricia Samford (1996) found that while also used by Native Americans and the English, the pits are primarily found in structures inhabited by slaves (Samford 1996:100) and William Kelso
(1984), head of the Jamestown Rediscovery Project, argues that root cellars are one of the most distinctive features of African American dwellings in early colonial America and that African slaves likely introduced the features to colonial society. Kelso points to the fact that the pits only appear once the African slave trade is underway as evidence that they are the product of black culture in America (Kelso 1984:60). Although common in the Upland South and Mid-Atlantic, just two examples of these pits are known archaeologically in the Lowland South and Florida, one at Spiers Landing in South Carolina (Singleton 1995:124) and the second at Bulowville.

Commonly known as root cellars, these storage pits were dug into the floor of a structure and commonly used to store crops during the fall and winter months (Kelso 1984:117). The Igbo people in what is now Nigeria used particular sub-floor pits, located directly in front of a hearth, to store yams (Samford 2007; Singleton 1995:124) and through the application of macrobotanical analysis at the Utopia quarter site on Kingsmill plantation (1675-1775), Patricia Samford (2007) has demonstrated that Africans in America adopted the practice to their new environment, using hearth-fronting pits to store sweet potatoes. Leland Ferguson suggests, “beneath the English-style architecture of the Kingsmill quarters, African American slaves found a way to assert their culture, as well as supplement their rations” (Ferguson 1992:58).

The pit at Cabin 1 at Bulowville is similar to the Igbo pits in its proximity to the hearth and may have been used as root storage as well. Sweet potatoes, an early summer crop in Florida, would have needed to be stored in a cool, well-ventilated space, like a large pit. Whereas sub-floor pits dug into clay would have kept produce from freezing in the Virginia winter, the regular evaporation of water from Cabin 1’s sandy pit would likely have kept produce chilled.
Figure 5-7. Excavation of a sub-floor pit at the Utopia III Site. Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery.

However, these sub-floor storage pits, being only accessible to the inhabitants of the cabin and invisible to the outside viewer, could also have provided a means of inconspicuous resistance. The cellars may have been used to store contraband or to simply allowed a level of privacy and autonomy unknown in the public spaces of a plantation (Beck 2006:71). Samford also recognized the potential use of these spaces as shrines or places of religious focus and drew a connection between subfloor pits found in Virginia slave quarters and Ibo house shrines, used for the veneration of divinities and ancestors alike (Davidson 2015:101, Samford 2007:150-173). Additionally, William DeBoer’s work in Virginia argues that Eastern Woodland Indians may have used sub-floor pits as a form of “resistance to new and potentially oppressive sociopolitical
orders” (Samford 1996:100) and it stands to reason that African and African American slaves did the same. The simple existence of private space, potentially used for covert purposes or religious practice, suggests the potential for resistance.

Figure 5-8. Subfloor pit and chimney base at Cabin 1 Bulow Plantation, circle denotes chimney fall inside empty pit, from Davidson and Ibarrola (2016).

However, while the use of sub-floor pits for religious purposes might help to explain the differential construction techniques used, it does not explain the absence of material within the pit at Bulowville. According to historical documents, slaves left many items behind when they were evacuated, everything from corn to furniture. James Davidson, in his study of animal sacrifice at Kingsley Plantation (2015), established that shrines were commonplace in West African domestic settings and utilized everyday items. Davidson cites the surgeon and trader John Smith from his Trade and Travel in the Gulph [sic] of Guinea, who notes that even the poorest home in 1840s Guinea has a little alter, decorated with assorted personal items such as
handmade carvings, tobacco pipes, snuff boxes, glass bottles, pictures and drawings (Smith 1851:67). He also cites more contemporary studies which note that twentieth-century Yoruba’s private shrines housed “sacred objects like old dane guns, materials like toy-boats, pieces of iron rods and … ritual objects like kolanuts, earthenwares and dried pieces of yams“ (Adewale 1988:43). William Kelso found coins, usable tools, imported ceramics and food trash in sub-floor pits (Kelso 1984). If the pit at Bulow Plantation did contain special religious items, they would likely have been commonplace items that would be left behind in a rush to safety.

At the Hernández orange grove, the cabin’s location is a strong indication that the storage pits were used for storage rather than for acts of resistance or religion. Located amongst orange trees and outside the city center, the domestic structure at 71 Park Place is representative of a unique urban practice of slavery. First under Spanish rule and later as a result of Spanish influence, slavery in Florida’s cities was often vastly different than on its rural plantations. Historian William Rogers notes that in 19th century Apalachicola, “Blacks were fairly unrestricted, some living apart from their masters in rented houses,” and in St. Augustine, “many [slaves] lived in their own homes, away from their master’s residence, almost as if they were free men” (Rivers 2000:78, 81). Although the circumstances did not change the ultimate reality of bondage, the common urban practices of hiring out laborers, training slaves in skilled trades, and allowing slaves to live apart from their masters created an environment much different than the strictly controlled plantation landscape. Not only would the slaves who lived at 71 Park Place have enjoyed relatively free movement around the city of St. Augustine, they would have had a much greater degree of privacy in their domestic space, outside of the direct surveillance of Martin Hernández, an overseer, or even fellow slaves. This difference potentially explains the
location of the storage pits outside of the cabin footprint. With greater privacy and autonomy in daily life, the need for concealed spaces would likely decline.

Site Location, Visibility, and Defense

Location and privacy are central to the interpretation of the sub-floor pits and housing arrangements at Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place. Surveillance played a pivotal role in the life of a slave; surveillance, privacy, and visibility were also critical in the lives of Maroons. Maroon settlements were located and constructed strategically. Towns were situated in inaccessible mountain caves or thick tropical rainforests and often utilized natural barriers or constructed inconspicuous camouflage (Cheryl White, personal communication 2015). In Florida, Maroon towns were situated near swamps or surrounded by flooded marsh-land (Howard 2013:113). The inaccessibility and invisibility of Maroon sites is one of the defining features of Maroon society according to Price’s (1979) comparative study and according to MacCauley’s (2000[1887]) survey it characterized Seminole settlements as well. From MacCauley (2000[1887]:499):

This invisibility of a Seminole’s house from the vicinity may be taken as a marked characteristic of his home. If possible, he hides his house, placing it on an island and in a jungle. As we neared the hammock we found that the approach to it was difficult. On horseback there was no trouble in getting through the water and the annoying saw-grass, but I found it difficult to reach the island with my vehicle.

It may be expected that Peliklikaha was a well-hidden, substantially fortified town simply given its status as a Maroon village or considering its inhabitants’ close ties to the Seminoles, however, it appears that the town was not as concealed or inaccessible as one might assume. Certainly, the size of the settlement would have drawn attention; one soldier noted that one-hundred runaways from Georgia were living at the site (McCall 1974[1868]). Terry Weik also notes that the town’s fences were not necessarily true barricades (Weik 2009:217; Weik 2012:128). Although General Eustis gave directions to destroy houses and fences, the fences
may have only been significant as part of the Maroon’s cattle operations, and the lithograph depicting the town’s destruction depicts the fences as thin lines, not massive barriers or formal defenses. Additionally, the wetlands surrounding the hill on which Peliklikaha is located would have dried up in the winter season, making them more useful for agriculture than defense (Weik 2012:128). Finally, the inhabitants of Peliklikaha had supposedly left the town weeks before U.S. soldiers arrived there (Weik 2012:128), suggesting that Maroons never intended to defend the site.

Conversely, Bulow Plantation, whether intentionally or unintentionally, was highly defensible. The same arrangement that allowed for the close supervision of slaves, also afforded the site’s inhabitants an advantage over attacking forces and a means of escape if necessary. Although the Hernández orange grove was not particularly defensible on its own, its close proximity to the Castillo and the heart of St. Augustine meant that it was one of the best-protected plantations in the region. However, this does not mean that Europeans and Euro-Americans were necessarily more concerned with defense than the Seminoles or Maroons. The existence of strategic hideouts, like Kettle Island on the Withlacoochee River (Carr and Steele 1993:266; Prince 1837), suggests that they simply utilized a more complex defense system than did plantation owners.

**Ceramics**

Although many objects of daily use do not often preserve in the archaeological record, pottery survives. Leather, wood, and other organic materials decompose quickly when exposed to water and other environmental factors, while ceramics, as a result of firing, are more durable and consequently, one of the most commonly recovered items at archaeological sites (Downs 1995; Howard 2002:76; Kersey 1981:171; McCall 1974:222). Throughout history, pottery has been used to store and transport goods, for cooking and serving foods, and even for sacred or
religious practices (Weik 2009). Ceramic production and distribution within the historic period is relatively well documented, compared to other goods, and ceramic analysis can lend insight into various aspects of both daily life and larger social patterning, from social and economic status to consumer choice. The following analysis of ceramics recovered from the study sites breaks the collections down by type, form, and origin in order to get at the issues of ethnogenesis and resistance.

**Identification of Ceramic Type**

A handful of Native American pottery types were recovered from the three sites. Locally produced, these ceramics were constructed using non-uniform clays and hand-building methods, and were fired at low temperatures. Of the recovered Native American ceramics, the least well-documented type was brushed Seminole-style pottery, also known as Chattahoochee Brushed, found exclusively at Peliklikaha. These ceramics, although part of a Creek brushed-pottery tradition dating back hundreds of years in the Southeastern United States, do not often appear in the historic record (Waselkov and Smith 2000; Weik 2002:112; Weisman 2000a:303). Most contemporary information about the pottery has been generated by archaeological research, which defines the Seminole ceramic tradition by its dark clay, almost exclusive use of hollow forms, and characteristic “brushed” decoration. Seminole pottery is gray-brown to black in color, approximately five to eight millimeters thick, and sand or grit tempered (Goggin 1953). Common vessel forms include small bowls, large globular pots, and lozenge shaped jars (Weik 2002:113). Although not all vessels have decoration, it is common for all forms to have light brushing on the exterior surface and rims are decorated with a variety of motifs (Goggin 1953). The great range of rim styles, including triangular impressions, incised lines, and combinations of the two marks, may indicate clan affiliation (Sears 1959:29; Weisman 1989:45), however, more research is necessary to confirm that correlation. Sand-tempered sherds are also often
recovered at Seminole sites, but the dark-colored brushed ceramic type, dating from around 1700 to 1900, is the only uniquely Seminole style pottery (Weik 2002:113).

St. John’s ware, recovered exclusively at 71 Park Place, although an older type than Seminole brushed pottery, was produced in various iterations from 1000 BCE to 1565 CE and is the most ubiquitous ceramic type in North Florida; consequently, it is much more thoroughly documented than some other types. St. John’s ware has a dark grey or black paste and is tempered with sponge spicules, which gives the finished product a chalky feel. St. John’s pottery is formed by coiling, and typically takes the shape of a large, shallow bowl (Herron 1978:6-8). Made by the Timucua of North Florida and Southeastern Georgia, it has often been found within 18th and 19th century contexts in St. Augustine (Gaske 1982:108).

Thick walls and a coarse texture characterize San Marcos ware, also recovered exclusively at 71 Park Place, as its paste is tempered with sand, limestone, or shell. Vessels of this type are often stamp-decorated, however, plain and red-filmed varieties also exist. The most common forms are globular pots and shallow bowls; however, San Marcos type plates have also been recovered archaeologically (Smith 1948:314). Indians living in and around St. Augustine and the Spanish missions in the 18th century produced San Marcos for both their own use and for commercial purposes; items made for European consumption often take traditionally European forms, for example a bowl with a foot ring or a mug with a handle, and vessels with red-film decorations were popular amongst the clergy. The Guale of Southern coastal Georgia brought the San Marcos tradition to the region in the 16th century and it became the “most predominant ware” found at 18th century Spanish Florida sites (Otto and Lewis 1974:102).

A number of European and Euro-American type coarse earthenwares were also recovered, the majority coming from 71 Park Place. Spanish olive jar or storage jar, the “most
distinctively Spanish of the coarse earthenware,” found at practically every Spanish site in the Atlantic world (Deagan 1987:30-31), was recovered from 71 Park Place. Used for storage and transportation, the Spanish olive jar persisted from the 15th century through the 19th century (Deagan 1987:31). The ware has a light-colored paste with large grainy inclusions, typically unglazed or with an internal green glaze. Sherds of unidentifiable unglazed coarse earthenware, dissimilar to Spanish olive jar or any Native American type were recovered from both Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place as well.

Six unique types of lead-glazed coarse earthenware were recovered from the sites. Slipware, common tableware in the 17th and 18th centuries, was recovered from all three sites. Originally produced in Germany and Holland, slipware soon became popular in England and German immigrants eventually began producing the ware in the United States (Hildyard 2005:10). The ceramic has a red clay base, covered in a clear lead glaze with slip (diluted clay) decorations of yellow and red (Hildyard 2005:12). The most common forms were plates, mugs, bowls, and pitchers. Although the type lost popularity over time, especially with the introduction of refined earthenwares in the mid-18th century, slipware vessels were used until the 20th century (Hildyard 2005:10). Five of the lead-glazed types were only recovered at 71 Park Place: El Morro, Buckley ware, Astbury ware, Jackfield ware, and Delftware. El Morro, produced primarily in the 17th century, is a wheel-thrown ware with visible sand-tempering, which gives the glazed surface a visibly a grainy texture. The exact place of origin and period of manufacture for El Morro in unknown, however, Spain and Mexico are the most likely production centers (Deagan 1987). Buckley ware, originating in Wales and produced in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, is constructed by mixing two clays, one light and the other dark. The fired object is glazed with a lustrous-black lead glaze and often takes the form of wide-mouthed storage jars.
Astbury ware, thin red earthenware with ginger colored lead glaze, was produced in England in the 18th century. The ware existed in plain, slipped, and molded varieties (Noel Hume 1970) and was used exclusively for tea pots and cups, coffee pots, and bowls (Poole 1995). Jackfield ware, also manufactured in England in the 18th century, was similarly used almost exclusively for teapots, cups, and saucers. Jackfield has a very hard, dark purple of red paste and a shiny, metallic looking black glaze on both the exterior and interior surfaces (South 1977). Finally, a chalky, light colored paste and pale blue tin-based enamel characterize Delftware, produced in England and Holland in the 17th through 19th centuries (Noel Hume 1970; Miller 1991). Delftware was decorated with hand-painting, sponge painting, or left plain and was used for everything from tableware to chamber pots, vases to medicine jars.

Refined earthenwares were the most common ceramic type at both Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place and plain wares (Creamwares, Pearlwares, and Whitewares) are heavily represented at all three sites. The famous English potter, Josiah Wedgewood was the first to produce Creamware, a white or cream-colored ware, which imitated Chinese porcelain. Copper was added to the lead glaze covering the thin, compact ware, giving it its characteristic color. This ceramic type remained in production from the late 18th to early 19th centuries, although Pearlware quickly replaced it in popularity (Miller 1991; Noel Hume 1969). Pearlware had the same thin body and compact but slightly porous paste as Creamware, but with cobalt added to its clear lead glaze instead of copper. This gave the ware a faint blue tint, most visible around footrings, handles, and other areas where glaze pooling occurs. Over time, Pearlware technology improved, paste became whiter and harder and it became less and less necessary to add cobalt to the glaze to achieve the desired look. Eventually, in the early to mid 19th century, the type came to be known as Whiteware. All three iterations of this simple white-colored refined earthenware
were produced in England, and in a wide-variety of forms, from pitchers and basins to plates and soup bowls. Additionally, a number of different decorative forms existed, including transfer printing, edging, handpainting, and decal. English Creamware, Pearlware, and Whiteware vessels were also used in the production of Annular-ware, a type of slipped refined earthenware, decorated with bright bands of clay as well as cat’s eye, trailing, dendritic, and rouletted designs. Annularware, which was solely produced in hollow forms (chamber pots, bowls, jugs, pitchers, mugs, etc.), remained popular from the late 18th century in the early 20th. English manufacturers were also the leading producers of Ironstone China. Ironstone, recovered exclusively at Peliklikaha, was produced in England from the early 19th century until the 20th century (Weik 2002). A very white, very hard paste and a thick glass-like glaze characterize this ware, which is typically undecorated (Miller 1991). Another English attempt to imitate Chinese porcelain, ironstone was incredibly hard and durable, but much thicker than real porcelain or the other English plainwares which preceded it. Porcelain, the inspiration for centuries of British potters, describes a range of ceramic types originating in East Asia, however this paper utilizes past studies which refer to the ware more generally and consequently, the more broad category will also be used here. Both the Chinese and Japanese produced this extremely hard ceramic with white paste and a thin, clear glaze, beginning as early as the mid 16th century and continuing to the present (Deagan 2002; Miller 2002). Porcelain varies in thickness but is generally thin and over the course of its production has been decorated with hand-painting in various styles and colors.

The final ceramic category is stoneware. The stoneware tradition began in the Rhine Valley, in modern Belgium and Germany, in 1500. Eventually production of the hard, vitreous utilitarian ware spread to England and then to the United States, increasing in variety and range
over time. Four unique stoneware types were recovered, as well as a number of unidentifiable stoneware sherds. White salt-glazed stoneware and Brown salt-glazed stoneware were recovered from both Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place. White-salt glazed stoneware was produced in England in the 18th century, until being replaced by refined earthenwares like Whiteware and Ironstone. Its characteristic salt-glaze gave finished vessels an “orange peel” finish and the thin-bodied ware, decorated variously with molding, incising, and painting, was used for tea pots and cups as well as plates and serving platters. Brown salt-glazed stoneware originated in England in the late 17th century, but was also produced in America beginning in the early 18th century and persisted through the 20th century. The ware often appeared in taverns as beer mugs and jugs, and besides impressed, incised, and molded patterns, also featured tavern symbols and royal initials. Westerwald and Black basalt stoneware were both recovered at 71 Park place alone. Westerwald or Rhenish stoneware originated in the Rhine Valley in the late 16th century but shifted to Westerwald in the 17th century and although the ware at first consisted of simple grayish white vessels, over time, cobalt and manganese painting, molding, incising, stamping, and rouletting were incorporated into the tradition. Like other salt-glazed stonewares, Westerwald has a shiny, bumpy, “orange peel” finish and most commonly took the form of jars, mugs, and chamber pots. Black basalt stoneware, on the other hand, has a smooth, unglazed finish. Introduced by Josiah Wedgewood as an imitation of Etruscan vases and produced in England in the mid 18th to mid 19th centuries, Black Basalt Stoneware is made from a black paste, decorated with stamped motifs or geometric engine turning, and fired in an oxidizing atmosphere. The type, which appeared as teapots, cups, saucers, and vases, was most commonly used as a mourning ware (South 1977). The unidentifiable stoneware sherds from Bulow
Plantation and Peliklikaha fit the standard description of hard, vitreous stoneware, but lacked identifying glaze or decoration to be assigned to a more specific type.

Table 5-1. Ceramic types present at each site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Production Range</th>
<th>Peliklikaha</th>
<th>71 Park Place</th>
<th>Bulow Plantation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATIVE AMERICAN WARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>North Florida</td>
<td>1625-1702</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered Plain</td>
<td>Southeast U.S.</td>
<td>1730-1835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole Brushed</td>
<td>Southeast U.S.</td>
<td>c. 1700-present</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Native American</td>
<td>Southeast U.S.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COARSE EARTHENWARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisque</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1600-1802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley ware</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1650-1810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1640-1800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Morro</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1600-1770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-glazed coarse earthenware</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1490-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine ware</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1700-1775</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Jar/Storage Jar</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1500-1800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Coarse Earthenware</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1490-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip-glazed redware</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1750-1820</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Tin-glazed</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1490-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coarse earthenware</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1600-1800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unglazed coarse earthenware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1720-1805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STONEWARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black basalt</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1750-1820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown stoneware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1690-1900</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID stoneware</td>
<td>Germany/US</td>
<td>1500-1900</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1575-1775</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1720-1805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFINED EARTHENWARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular ware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1785-1840</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astbury ware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1725-1750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1762-1820+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone China</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1840-1930</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the sites had a variety of ceramic types represented in the material assemblage, however, the ratio of types varies significantly across the sites. At 71 Park Place, the ceramic assemblage included Native American wares, coarse earthenware, and stoneware, but was overwhelmingly (83.5%, N=812) refined earthenware. That category included pearlware, whiteware, and creamware. Similarly, at Bulow Plantation, the total assemblage (N=299) represented a variety of types, including Native American wares, stoneware, and slipware but was dominated by refined earthenware (53.8%, N=161). When Native American wares, none of which are likely related to the 18th century occupation of the site are removed, refined earthenware represents an even larger portion of the total assemblage (70.6%). Conversely, the assemblage from Peliklikaha, which had a total of 1037 ceramic fragments, had a greater variety of major ceramic types. Although Native America wares dominate the site overall, that category consists of Seminole-style brushed pottery and unidentifiable, plain Native American wares. Brushed ceramics are the largest portion of the assemblage (37.2%, N=386), but are far from a majority of the sherds. Refined earthenwares, including Creamware (10.2%, N=106) and Ironstone (19.7%, N=204), represent 33.1% (N=343) of the total assemblage, and unidentifiable Native American types (10.8%, N=112) and Stoneware (9.6%, N=100), each represent about 10% of the total assemblage. Although 71 Park Place has the greatest number of specific ceramic types (twenty-nine, as compared to eleven types at both Bulow Plantation at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Production Range</th>
<th>Peliklikaha</th>
<th>71 Park Place</th>
<th>Bulow Plantation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1780-1840</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>China/Japan</td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Refined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1762-1830+</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1820-1900+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1830-1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peliklikaha), the ceramic assemblage at Peliklikaha is more evenly divided amongst the major ceramic categories, as defined by technological difference.

Figure 5-9. Major ceramic types by count.

The dominance of refined earthenwares at 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation, as compared to the more equal distribution of types at Peliklikaha, is likely reflective of the means by which inhabitants of each site acquired goods. Slaves acquired ceramics in a variety of ways, depending on their access to the market and their master’s wealth and sense of responsibility. Some slaves received new ceramics from their masters or were able to use money earned at side-jobs to purchase ceramics themselves, either from Native Americans or in Euro-American markets. Others received second-hand pottery from their master or overseer, and some enslaved peoples even produced their own ceramics (Adams and Boling 1989; Ferguson 1992). Inhabitants of 71 Park Place likely acquired their ceramics through some combination of gifts and hand-me-downs from the Hernandez family, and through direct purchase. Given their proximity to a multi-ethnic port city and their distance from their masters, they are more likely to
have purchased their own ceramics than are the inhabitants of Bulow Plantation, who, isolated by both location and self-dependency, may have rarely had access to market goods. Slaves at Bulow Plantation may have interacted with Native American traders on occasion; however, they most likely did not have any disposable income or items for trade.

The abundance of refined earthenwares of European origin and the lack of coarse earthenwares of Native American origin at 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation are most likely attributable to the effects of availability and preference. While European mass-produced goods were widely available, St. John’s, San Marcos, and the other early Native America types would have had to be curated pieces, and the only contemporary Native American type, Seminole brushed, does not appear on the two plantation sites. While the majority of refined earthenwares recovered have production dates close to the founding of each of the sites, some of the Native American wares stopped production as many as 200 years prior to site establishment. The few Native American sherds that do appear at each site probably predate the sites’ 19th century occupations. At Bulow Plantation, indigenous ceramic types consistently appear at the lowest levels of material culture, suggesting that they predate the plantation occupation of the site (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016). Similarly, at 71 Park Place, the Native American types are not consistently distributed throughout the cultural deposits and may have been left behind by earlier residents of the 18th century Pocotalaca mission, located just south of the Hernández orange grove (Beck 2006:27). Additionally, if the slaves at each site received their ceramics as hand-me-downs or if their European and Euro-American masters purchased the pottery for them, cultural preference probably played a role in selecting European goods. Although San Marcos ceramics were widely used by Spanish colonists in St. Augustine, the Timucua potters who produced that ware were no longer active in the 19th century and European ceramics were the
most widely available pottery. Not only were European goods more readily available to Euro-Americans living in Florida, they would have been more familiar with those products and would not likely have gone out of the way to purchase Seminole pottery that they were unfamiliar with or more costly, hand-made American goods.

The ceramic assemblages at 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation reflect the availability of European ceramics and Euro-American preference for them, and the assemblage at Peliklikaha seems to suggest that even given the availability of other ceramic types, European mass-produced goods were inescapable. Maroons, like slaves, acquired their ceramics in a variety of ways. Some took dishes with them when escaping; others stole ceramics from plantations and trading posts near their settlements. Florida Maroons however, through their partnership with the Seminole, were also able to take part in formal trading relationships. When the Seminole first settled permanently in Florida, Euro-Americans did not oppose their movement as the limited Spanish and British colonies in the region gained needed economic and military partners. The tribe fulfilled colonists’ demand for animal skins and cattle, and their political support could be bought with gifts of dishes, clothing, food, and various manufactured items (Covington 1960:71; Landers 1999:72–73). Historical records from trading companies, such as Panton and Leslie, and archaeological evidence from trading posts, like Spalding’s Lower Store document these exchanges (Lewis 1969; Sturtevant 1971) and many of the artifacts recovered at Peliklikaha, including ceramics, likely came from these types of exchanges (Weik 2002:112-120). The danger of re-enslavement may have prohibited some Maroons from trading with Europeans and Euro-Americans, or at least complicated the process, and they may have relied on Seminole allies to visit urban markets and traders on their behalf (Weik 2009:225). However, it has also been suggested that it was actually the Maroons who acted as cultural brokers, not the
Seminole. Forced to speak European languages and accept Euro-American laws, former slaves
had been socialized, through enslavement, in European society (Fairbanks 1978). While many
Native Americans participated in the plantation economy and married Euro-Americans
(Weisman 2000), the possibility that Africans and African-Americans played intermediary seems
especially likely given the role played by prominent Maroon interpreters, like Abraham, and the
nativistic movement that gained traction amongst the Seminole in the early 19th century.

The ceramic assemblage at Peliklikaha contrasts sharply with that of Seminole sites of
the same era, where European and Euro-American ceramics are totally absent. Although they
appear at numerous Seminole sites predating the Seminole Wars, Euro-American ceramics
disappear from Seminole sites in the early 19th century (Weisman 1989:311). It is possible that
access to these wares was limited during war, however, the “most compelling explanation for the
lack of these ceramics is their conscious rejection by the Seminoles” (Weisman 2000:312). As
Brent Weisman (2000) argues, rejection of European goods was equated with the rejection of
Euro-American society and, accordingly, the fortification of native identity. The use, or
rejection, of material culture as an element of resistance was practiced amongst Plains Indians
and native Californians (Nabokov 1996:43-44), and it seems that the Seminole adopted this
technique as well. As Terry Weik (2009:225-226) explains:

the Nativist sentiments that existed in Seminole territory resulted in a rejection of
European (American) ceramics by more militant groups such as the followers of
Asi Yahola (also called “Powell” or “Osceola”). “Redstick Creek” soldiers and
refugees, who fled after their defeat at the hands of the U.S. military … may have
helped stimulate the Seminoles to organize their resistance to various forms of
European material and martial influence. The Withlacoochee Cove sites, which
formed a nucleus of nineteenth-century Seminole resistance around leaders such as
Asi Yahola, contained no Euro-American-made ceramics … differ[ing] from many
earlier and later Seminole Indian sites, which did employ a much larger proportion
of Euro-American ceramics.
While the European and Euro-American ceramics recovered at Peliklikaha may have been acquired before the Nativistic movement took hold or after, it is possible that the presence of European and Euro-American ceramics, in the form of stonewares, slip-trailed redware, and refined earthenwares, are representative of a different political and cultural dynamic. Although Maroons allied with the Seminole and adopted many Seminole customs, they did not necessarily join in their rejection of European goods and culture. Daniel Sayers (pers. comm. 2016) has argued that Maroons, particularly those living in the Great Dismal Swamp which straddles North Carolina and Virginia, in their decision to leave their places of enslavement permanently, were also rejecting Western economic modes and social standards. However, several generations of Florida Maroons proved themselves willing to make alliances with both British and Spanish colonial governments. Despite their close ties with the Seminole, Maroons may not have had the same cultural pride and sense of separatism. Instead they may have been more directly driven by opportunism, or simply operating within a worldview that did not place them in opposition to all Europeans and Euro-Americans.

It should also be noted that, as discussed above, the majority of pottery circulating in North American markets in the colonial period was European in origin (Weik 2002:116). The presence of European ceramics at Peliklikaha is not necessarily indicative of Maroon acceptance of Eurocentric beliefs or a Euro-America economic system. The presence of European or Euro-American goods on any African, African-American, or Native American site does not indicate assimilation. These items were interpreted through each group’s unique cultural and social world-view (Lightfoot et al. 1998). Instead, the presence of European and Euro-American ceramics at sites like Peliklikaha, speaks to the ubiquitous nature of mass-produced goods in the 18th and 19th centuries. While Florida Maroons may still have needed the threat of Seminole
force to protect them, it seems that they were able to participate in the global economy, which happened to be dominated by European products, on their own terms. Maroons traded agricultural products, like melons, corn, and cattle for European goods, including ceramics. While ceramic assemblages from Seminole sites of the same period point to Seminole nativism, African and African-American Maroons continued trading with Euro-Americans and buying European products.

Notably, the use of European refined earthenwares by the residents of Peliklikaha did not preclude the use of Native American ceramics as well. Native American wares are 57.2% of the total assemblage and Seminole brushed pottery represents a large portion of that group (65.1%, N=386). This abundance of Seminole pottery begs the question: who made it? One possibility is that Maroons received the pottery from the Seminole, similar to the gift of ceramics from a plantation owner to slaves. However, as discussed in Chapter Two, the Seminole Maroon relationship, although characterized as that of master and slave by Europeans, was more like an alliance of equals (Mulroy 1993a, 1993b). The Maroons living at Peliklikaha may have still received the pottery as gifts from their allies or may have purchased the vessels outright. There is also the possibility that the Maroons produced the brushed pottery themselves. African potters, already familiar with the fundamentals of pottery making, may have imitated Seminole pottery as a gesture of goodwill or an outward symbol of the close alliance; Seminole potters may have taught African-Americans the skill upon request or upon recognition of need; or, Seminole women may have produced ceramics for their Maroon families. Within Seminole society, women were the primary ceramic producers (Sturtevant 1987) and could have brought that skill to new Black Seminole families. However, while Seminole women married Maroon
men more often than Maroon women married Seminole men, due to the restrictions of a matrilineal society (Mulroy 1993a:299), intermarriage was still uncommon.

The difficulty of assigning artistic and technological ownership to these ceramics suggests that they should be differently understood or categorized. Perhaps referring to them as Seminole brushed ceramics is misleading and the term “Colonoware” might be more appropriate. Colonoware, unglazed, coiled earthenware first identified in the 1930s, is variously attributed to Native Americans and Africans and is found from Virginia to Florida (Ferguson 1992:36).

Although Ivor Noel Hume (1962) argued that the ware was made by Native Americans and sold to slaves, others were not convinced. Richard Polhemus (1977) first identified the similarity between the ware and artifacts from West African. Then, on the basis of comparison to ceramics from Ghana and the West Indies, with a focus on vessel shape and decoration, Leland Ferguson (1980) argued that colonoware was not a solely Native American construction, that it had African inspiration also, as well as European (Ferguson 1980). Slave ceramic assemblages from the 16th and 17th centuries are composed of up to 50% colonoware (Ferguson 1992:8; Wheaton and Garrow 1985:251). However, the ware disappeared in the 18th century due to the widespread availability of European ceramics (Ferguson 1992:107). Today, certain colonoware traditions have been successfully attributed to a particular group, such as the San Marcos colonoware made by Timucua for Spanish consumption (Deagan 2002), however, many items are still ambiguous in origin.

The brushed ceramics from Peliklikaha might be thought of as Colonoware given their multi-ethnic and ambiguous origins. However, unlike the Colonowares Noel Hume and Ferguson refer to: they fit within a defined ceramic tradition. The 386 sherds meet all of the criteria for Seminole brushed pottery; from color to thickness, these ceramics appear to be
Seminole made. It is only their context that suggests otherwise. But that context is significant. Just as the presence of European or Euro-American goods at a slave site does not indicate assimilation, neither does the presence of Seminole ceramics suggest Maroon assimilation of Seminole culture. Further research is necessary to identify why Maroons used brushed pottery and its place in their worldview.

**Form**

Although equivalent data on form was not available for all three sites, analysis suggests that hollow-wares dominated the ceramic assemblage at all three sites. Bulow Plantation was the assemblage most thoroughly evaluated for form; every sherd (excluding Native American wares, which were not evaluated for form) was categorized as flat, hollow or having an unidentifiable form. Ceramics from Cabin 1 at Bulow were overwhelmingly from hollow vessels, with 80.6% (N=156) of the 230 analyzed sherds identified as hollow-wares. Flat-wares made up xx% (N=38) and 15.7% (N=36) of sherds were unidentifiable. A sample (N=503; 54.5%) of the total assemblage from 71 Park Place was analyzed for form and although a large portion, 55.3%, of the assemblage was unidentifiable (N=293) (mostly due to their fragmentary nature), of the identifiable sherds 86.1% (N=204) were hollow and 13.9% (N=33) were flat. Of the total assemblage, 38.5% were hollow and 6.2% were flat. There is a certain degree of bias involved in form analysis as it is much simpler to identify a sherd as coming from a hollow vessel than it is to definitively state that it came from a flat vessel, however, the identifiable sherds from both plantation settings were overwhelmingly hollow in form.

The prevalence of hollow-wares at Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place fits the general model for vessel use by early 19th century enslaved populations. The hypothesis, first deduced by John Solomon Otto in his work at the Cooper Plantation on St. Simon’s Island, was that an enslaved diet of the early 19th century relied more heavily upon liquid foods, such as soups,
porridges and stews, than large cuts of meat. The material result of that diet would be a large number of bowls and, compared to the plantation master’s house where cuts of meat were served on platters and eaten on plates, fewer pieces of flat-ware (Otto 1980; Otto 1984). Since Otto’s identification of the pattern in the 1980s, it has been observed at a number of plantations, including the nearby Kingsley Plantation and scholars have debated the underlying significance of such a pattern (Adams and Boling 1989, Davidson and Ibarrola 2016, Farnsworth 1995, Moore 1985, Otto 1984, Young 2000). Was the reliance on liquid foods like stews a matter of practicality? Stews could be left on the fire while slaves went into the field to work and would have been able to make the most of undesirable or small cuts of meat (Otto 1984:174). Or is the predominance of hollow-wares an issue of cultural preference? As will be discussed in greater detail in the following section, West African meals typically consisted of a starch and a vegetable stew, made in large earthenware or iron pots, and served in gourds or ceramic bowls. The use of hollow vessels may reflect culinary and cultural preference (Ferguson 1992:97).

Although a significant number of sherds from Peliklikaha have not been evaluated for form, there are a few factors that suggest that hollow vessels also dominated the assemblage from that site. The only two mentions of form in previous research are observations that Ironstone at the site primarily took the form of plates, cups, and platters (Weik 2002:113) and that “most low-fired earthenwares at Peliklikaha with identifiable features appear to have been globular, round-bottomed, small (e.g., 7 cm rim diameter), and thin-walled (5–8 mm thick) bowls and pots (Weik 2002:112–121). Ironstone composes only 19.7% of the total assemblage. The most common ceramic type in the assemblage, brushed Seminole-style pottery, which represents 37.2% of the collected sherds, was only made in jar, bowl, and pot form (Weik 2002:113). This means that at least 37.2% of the total assemblage was from a hollow vessel.
Furthermore, hollow forms similarly dominated most contemporary Native American wares and the majority of stonewares were only produced in utilitarian bowl and jug forms, meaning that another 20.4% (N=212) of the assemblage is from a hollow vessel. With 57.6% of the ceramic assemblage represented by ceramic types that are only, or mostly, made as hollow vessels, it stands to reason that hollow-wares were the dominant vessel form at Peliklikaha.

Figure 5-10. Vessel form by count.

As with 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation, it makes sense that the ceramic assemblage at Peliklikaha is composed of mostly hollow vessels. The inhabitants of Peliklikaha would have had some of the same cultural and practical influences as their enslaved peers and Seminole culinary influence would have also led to the use of hollow-wares; whether as a result of the influence of the Seminole diet, which, much like West Africa cuisine, was built on a starchy base and a vegetable stew (MacCauley 2000[1887]), or Seminole nativism. The Seminoles themselves were only using Seminole made ceramics, and thus only using hollow-wares; archaeologists have noted the total absence of flat-wares on Seminole Indian sites of the period (Goggin 1958; Weisman 1989) and ethnographic reports suggest that Seminoles had little use for plates. Large bowls were used for communal stews and small bowls were used for dipping.
sauces or drinks (Weik 2009:231). Seminoles and Maroons were observed sharing pots of *sofkee*, a pudding like dish made from the root of the coontie plant or corn (Weisman 1989:123), and many see this “culinary communion” as symbolic of the close African and Seminole alliance (Porter 1996; Weik 2009:230).

**Origin/Source**

As noted above, the ceramic assemblages from all three sites reflect the ubiquity of Euro-American and European mass-produced ceramics and a closer look at production location, or source, highlights England’s domination of the global market. When considering source, overall, the assemblage from Bulow is the least diverse, coming from England, the United States, and local production sites. Peliklikaha’s ceramics have a wider range of origin, coming from China, England, the United States, and local production sites. The ceramic assemblage at 71 Park Place has by far the greatest diversity of origin. The ceramics from that site come from China, Holland, Germany, Spain, England, Mexico, the United States, and local production sites. Although Spanish and Mexican products dominate earlier colonial Florida sites, the Spanish government lifted trade restrictions in 1783 (Beidleman 1976:85) and mass-produced British wares quickly made their way into the market. At the time of the U.S. acquisition of Florida, Hispanic tablewares were still imported from Havana, Cuba and Puebla, Mexico (Deagan 1987:51); however, they were more expensive and rarer than British and American products (Cusick 1993), hence the widespread usage of British refined earthenwares.

The marked difference in range of product origin between Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place may be attributable to the effects of rural and urban settings. Mass-produced goods are much more accessible to those living near trading centers than their rural counterparts, the residents of 71 Park Place were simply closer to pottery dealers than the residents of Bulowville. Additionally, St. Augustine was still home to a large number of Iberian immigrants in the Second
Spanish and Territorial Periods. Hispanic products made available to that market, may not have made their way out to Anglo-planter's and their slaves, whether due to lack of demand or assumptions made by traders about preference. The cosmopolitan nature of St. Augustine gave urban slaves, who likely had greater autonomy than their rural counterparts, greater access to a wide variety of ceramics. The issue of autonomy is significant in our discussion of ceramics on plantations, simply because it cannot be assumed at any point of the consumption process.

As noted above, Maroons acquired their ceramics by a variety of means. Colonial governments gave Native Americans and Maroons dishes to curry favor (Weik 2002:121); 19th century Maroons raided plantations and army trains to obtain ceramics as well as ammunitions, dry goods, livestock, and silver (Simmons 1973[1822]:117,137; Porter 1996; Weik 2002:118-119; Weisman 1989:121); and Maroons engaged with traders and plantation owners alike, possibly in the role of cultural brokers, in order to obtain needed goods (Lewis 1969; Weik 2002:118). This opportunistic accumulation makes it difficult to determine how specific items got to Maroon sites, however, it also suggests that Maroons had access to a high variety of ceramic goods from a variety of sources. Unlike their Seminole allies, Maroons were not intent on displaying ethnic loyalty through their use of ceramics, at least not loyalty to the Seminole Tribe and their use of European and even Asian ceramics reaffirms that Maroons and the Seminole had different material priorities. Closer analysis of specific trading accounts may provide greater insight into the line between opportunism and preference among the Florida Maroons.
Fauna

Zooarchaeological materials, although less well preserved in Florida’s acidic soils than ceramics, offer relatively direct insight into an archaeological subject’s subsistence methods and foodways. The following analysis utilizes both formal specimen analyses and historical sources in order to discuss daily life, ethnogenesis, and resistance at each of the three sites. Faunal analysis occurred differently for each site and, unfortunately, the same level of formal analysis is not available for each site.

Analysis of faunal materials from Bulow Plantation was done by the author and took place primarily in the archaeology-teaching lab at the University of Florida using the comparative and taphonomic collections from that lab. A more focused analysis of bird specimens (Aves) was also conducted using the comparative collection of the Florida Museum of Natural History (FLMNH). This additional level of analysis was undertaken due to the limited range of birds represented in the teaching lab collection, however, the change in methodology may have affected the final results of the project. Furthermore, a number of elements were noted that are potentially identifiable given a larger comparative collection for mammals and continued
use of the FLMNH bird collection. The entirety of the faunal materials recovered from Cabin 1 was analyzed, however, analysis of materials from Cabin 3 has not yet been completed and the following discussion reflects materials from Cabin 1 only.

Analysis focused exclusively on vertebrate materials. Invertebrate specimens were collected in the field; however, they could not be included in the scope of this project for practical reasons and occurred relatively infrequently. Eggshell will be discussed in relation to some of the other materials analyzed, however, no detailed examination was made of that material beyond weighing. Additionally, although element, portion, side, taphonomy, fusion, and count were also recorded for the specimens from Bulow, the same information is not available for the sample from 71 Park Place and has been excluded from the following analysis.

Rochelle Marrinan, associate professor of anthropology at Florida State University, analyzed faunal materials from 71 Park Place in 2006 and the results of her analysis were included in Rita Beck’s (2006) thesis from that year. Marrinan’s analysis focused specifically on the organic materials from features identified during excavation including the barrel shaft well, the post-holes outlining the structure, and the two possible root cellars. Like my own analysis of materials from Bulow Plantation, analysis of faunal materials from 71 Park Place focused exclusively on vertebrate materials.

Unfortunately, formal specimen analysis has not yet been completed for Peliklikaha. Although some faunal material was collected from the site, it is not included in Terrance Weik’s (2002, 2012) dissertation or later discussion of the site. However, the author has begun analysis of the materials and that data will be included in future research about the site.
Results

The documented features from 71 Park Place yielded a total of 512 individual specimens, weighing 739.7 grams. Just under one half of this sample by count, 241 NISP or 52.1 grams, was unidentifiable due to the fragmentary nature of the material, however, 12 unique taxonomic identifications were made and many more specimens were roughly identified by size and family. Table 4-2 summarizes the findings of analysis. The faunal collection from Bulow Plantation yielded 34 distinct taxonomic identifications from a sample of over 620 specimens, including at least 41 unique individuals. Table 4-3 summarizes the findings of analysis.

The most common family by weight for both 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation is Mammalia. Mammal are not necessarily the most numerous specimens (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:157), but represent the largest identified species by far. The sample from 71 Park Place includes pig (*Sus scrofa*), deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), cow (*Bos Taurus*), and unidentified ungulate (Artiodactyla) specimens. Pig is by far the most represented species by weight and comprised 38.8%, 289.5g, of the total sample. In addition, 102.3g of material were attributed to the category of medium sized Mammalia and may very well be degraded pig specimens. At Bulow Plantation, the most common mammal by weight is cow, 96.5g or 24.17% of the total sample, however, only six specimens were identified as cow. The most common mammal at Bulow by specimen count is white-tailed deer (NISP=13), and other species include pig, opossum (*Didelphis virginianus*), squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*), mouse (*Mus musculus* [unconfirmed]), and indeterminate rodent.

By weight, Actinopterygii, or bony fish, represent small portions of each sample by weight. At 71 Park Place these fish make up just 1.54% (11.5g) of the total faunal sample and at Bulow Plantation just 2.8% (13.3g) of the total sample. Identified species include fish from a variety of aquatic habitats. At 71 Park Place both fresh (Siluriformes) and salt water catfish
(Ariidae) were identified. Other saltwater species include porgies (Sparidae), sheepshead
(Archosargus probatocephalus), and flounder (Bothidae). Mullet (Mugil cephalus) was the only
brackish species, meaning adaptable to both fresh and salt water, identified. At Bulow
Plantation, freshwater fish represented are bluegill (Lepomis macrochirus), sunfish
(Centrarchidae), and bowfin (Amia calva). Saltwater species include ladyfish (Elops saurus),
gafftopsail catfish (Bagre marinus), gulf flounder (Paralichthys albigutta), and pinfish (Lagodon
rhomboides) and brackish species include mullet (Mugil cephalus), red drum (Sciaenops
ocellatus), and black drum (Pogonias cromis) (J. W. White, personal communication).

Birds, or Aves, are the second largest contributing class in terms of weight for both 71
Park Place and Bulow Plantation. At 71 Park Place, one bird species was identified, chicken
(Gallus gallus), with specimens weighing a total of 12.2g or 1.63% of the total sample. At
Bulow Plantation, a smaller variety of the common domestic chicken, the Bantam chicken
(Gallus gallus bantam) was identified, along with a variety of migratory ducks, such as the
green-winged teal (Anas crecca carolinensis) and northern pintail (Anas acuta). Material from
the cabin also included snowy egret (Egretta thula), coot (Fulica americana), and swallow-tailed
kite (Elanoides forficatus) with birds weighing in at a total of 43.6g or 9.17% of the total faunal
material.

Although no specific Reptilia species were identified at 71 Park Place, 3.3g or 0.44% of
the total sample is attributable to the order Testudines. At Bulow Plantation, identified species
included two turtles; common box turtle (Terrapene carolina) and softshell turtle (Apalone
ferox); and one snake; the eastern racer (Coluber constrictor). These species represent 4.52% of
the faunal material from Bulow, or 21.5g.
No Chondrichthyes were identified in the sample from 71 Park Place and cartilaginous fish recovered from Cabin 1 included just two NISP, less than one percent of the total counted sample. Both specimens were heavily worn shark teeth, unidentifiable to a more specific taxon than the superorder Selachimorpha.

Table 5-2. Faunal material from 71 Park Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Wt(g)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>289.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>white-tailed deer</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>indeterminate ungulate</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Mammalia</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Mammalia (large)</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Mammalia (medium)</td>
<td></td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Mammalia (small)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mammalia</td>
<td></td>
<td>667.7</td>
<td>89.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gallus gallus</em></td>
<td>domestic chicken</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aves UID</td>
<td>indeterminate bird</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aves</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testudines</td>
<td>indeterminate turtle</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reptilia</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siluriformes</td>
<td>freshwater catfish</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariidae</td>
<td>marine catfish</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparidae</td>
<td>porgies</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Archosargus probatocephalus</em></td>
<td>sheepshead</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pogonias cromis</em></td>
<td>black drum</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mugil cephalus</em></td>
<td>mullet</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothidae</td>
<td>flounder family</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actinopterygii UID</td>
<td>unidentified fish</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actinopterygii</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebrata UID</td>
<td>unidentified vertebrates</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>52.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>746.8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Wt(g)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didelphis virginianus</td>
<td>opossum</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciurus carolinensis</td>
<td>squirrel</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus musculus</td>
<td>mouse</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>indeterminate rodent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odocoileus virginianus</td>
<td>white-tailed deer</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>18.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>30.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal UID</td>
<td>unidentified mammal</td>
<td>150.7</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mammalia</td>
<td></td>
<td>319.3</td>
<td>67.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egretta sp.</td>
<td>medium-sized herons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egretta thula</td>
<td>snow egret</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anas platyrhynchos</td>
<td>mallard</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anas discors</td>
<td>blue-winged teal</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anas acuta</td>
<td>northern pintail</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anas crecca</td>
<td>green-winged teal</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anas sp.</td>
<td>dabbling ducks</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aythya americana</td>
<td>redhead</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elanoides forficatus</td>
<td>swallow-tailed kite</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipitridae</td>
<td>diurnal birds of prey</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus bantam</td>
<td>bantam chicken</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulica americana</td>
<td>coot</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aves UID</td>
<td>unidentified bird</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>58.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aves</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrapene carolina</td>
<td>common box turtle</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apalone ferox</td>
<td>softshell turtle</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>71.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testudines</td>
<td>Indeterminate turtle</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>22.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coluber constrictor</td>
<td>eastern racer</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpentes</td>
<td>Indeterminate snake</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reptilia</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amia calva</td>
<td>bowfin</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elops saurus</td>
<td>ladyfish</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagre marinus</td>
<td>gafftopsail catfish</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepomis macrochirus</td>
<td>bluegill</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrarchidae</td>
<td>sunfish</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagodon rhomboides</td>
<td>pinfish</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogonias cromis</td>
<td>black drum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciaenops ocellatus</td>
<td>red drum</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Wt(g)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Paralichthys albigutta</em></td>
<td>gulf flounder</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actinopterygii UID</td>
<td>unidentified fish</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actinopterygii</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selachimorpha UID</td>
<td>shark</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Chondrichthyes</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrapoda UID</td>
<td>unidentified four-limbed vertebrates</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebrata UID</td>
<td>unidentified vertebrates</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>475.7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

The faunal collections from the cabin at 71 Park Place and Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation appear relatively similar upon first comparison. Side by side analysis of total weights and percentages by class demonstrate that the samples are both dominated by mammal specimens, representing 89.41 and 67.3% respectively, followed by birds, representing 1.63 and 9.2% respectively, of course, the natural bias of comparison by weight means that mammal contributions are overemphasized by the comparison. In general, the faunal materials from Bulow Plantation appear more evenly distributed across classes, while the sample from 71 Park Place is more dramatically dominated by Mammalia. Additionally, although a high percentage, by weight, of each sample was identifiable taxonomically, the high number of unidentifiable or partially identifiable fish in each sample is a reminder of the inherent biases in faunal identification.
Table 5-4. Comparison of cabins by faunal weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxa</th>
<th>Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation</th>
<th>Cabin at 71 Park Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of identified species</td>
<td>Wt(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mammalia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>319.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aves</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reptilia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actinopterygii</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chondrichthyes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrapoda UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebrata UID</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>474.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wild Resources**

Comparison of the two faunal assemblages for food sources reveals significant differences in consumption patterns at the two sites. While domestic animals are the majority of both assemblages by weight, with pig, cow, and chicken represented at each site, domestic species represent only 51.41% (114.7g out of the total 223.1g) of the identifiable faunal assemblage from Bulow Plantation and 93.71% (374.0g out of the total 399.1g) of the identifiable assemblage from 71 Park Place. Additionally, wild species from Bulow Plantation represent a much wider range of resources than those from 71 Park Place. Faunal materials from Cabin 1 included five different wild mammal species, nine wild bird species, two distinct turtle species, two distinct snake taxa, as well as twelve unique fish species (including shark). This pattern is indicative of a higher dependency on self-procured wild species at Bulow Plantation, which agrees with the model of wild species dependence established by a number of archaeologists working on slave sites in the antebellum South (McFarlane 1975, Otto 1980, Kelso 1984, Reitz et. al. 1985, Reitz 1994, Crader 1990, McKee 1999, Franklin 2001). Slaves in the Antebellum south ate wild game
and other wild fauna that consisted of estuarine fish, deer, small mammals, turtles, and alligators (Reitz 1991:37); and gathered wild produce (Ferguson 1992:94), and many historical sources suggest that the Florida environment provided an even greater variety of wild foods than the rest of the American South (Rivers 2000:128). The peninsula was “covered with fine rich hammocks, which [had] a great reputation for fertility” (Vignoles 1823:55), while numerous springs, lakes, rivers, and varied coastal environments housed abundant aquatic life.

Archaeological and historical records have demonstrated a reliance on wild resources within free black, Maroon, and Seminole society in Florida as well. Elizabeth Reitz (1994) asserts that free blacks and Maroons at Fort Mosé were even more self-sufficient than slaves on coastal plantations, with 49% of biomass at that site coming from wild resources (1994:31). Nathaniel Millet (2013), argues that the “lack of small animal bones found at [Prospect Bluff] provides strong archaeological evidence that the community was not desperately foraging for meat but rather was well supplied” and cites the fort’s former commander, Sir Edward Nicolls, as praising the former slaves manning the fort as “strong and expert rifle men,” who hunted in large and well-organized hunting parties for deer, bears, raccoons, possums, and wild birds (Millett 2013). Clay MacCauley, writing on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution’s Bureau for Ethnology in 1887, described the Seminole diet in great detail, including the many wild resources utilized by the tribe. Besides deer, opossum, rabbit, squirrel, bear, and gopher tortoise, the Seminole had access to:

wild fowl, duck, quail, and turkey in abundance… of fish, they can catch myriads of the many kinds which teem in the inland water of Florida, especially of the large bass, called “trout” by the whites of the State, while on the seashore they can get many forms of edible marine life, especially turtles and oysters. Equally well off are these Indians in respect to grains, vegetables, roots, and fruits… [including] the tender new growth of the tree called the cabbage palmetto… the abounding Koonti; also the wild potato… and peanuts in great quantities. Of fruits, the Seminole family may supply itself with bananas, oranges (Sour and sweet), limes, lemons,
guavas, pineapples, grapes (black and red), cocoa nuts, cocoa plums, sea grapes, and wild plums. And even with this enumeration the bill of fare is not exhausted. The Seminole, living in a perennial summer, is never at a loss when he seeks something, and something good, to eat (MacCauley 2000[1887]:504).

Agriculture

On the other hand, Africans in Florida, and across the Americas, played a vital role in the agricultural exchange between Europe, Africa, and the Americas that began in the 16th century. A number of crops made their way across the Atlantic, but so did agricultural skills and experience. Free and enslaved blacks alike had a hand in refining Florida’s cattle industry, utilizing grazing and herding techniques developed by East and West African societies over millennia (Brown and Rivers 2014:177). Africans were also integral to the successful introduction of rice and sorghum across the region, which along with okra, black-eyed peas, peanuts, watermelons, and eggplant are African crops readily adopted by Europeans and taken for granted by Floridians today (Brown and Rivers 2014:177; Ferguson 1992:93-94).

In turn, agriculture was central to slave subsistence. On plantations, personal gardens supplemented rations distributed by the overseer or planter and included a range of crops, from black-eyed peas, sweet potatoes, and corn to turnips and collard greens (Rivers 2000:130). The typical West African diet from this time involved very little meat. Instead, a starch, like rice, was served with a vegetable stew or sauce, made from beans or greens boiled down and mashed to a pulp (Ferguson 1992:94). As noted above, several vegetables popular in Africa, including okra, cowpeas, eggplant, and sesame, became part of the African American diet, as did European vegetables like turnips, collard greens, and cabbage and even Native American produce like squashes and corn. In Florida, slaves also benefitted from seasonal access to oranges and grapefruits (Rivers 2000:130).
Corn in particular, well adapted to heat and cheap to produce, unlike rice, became a staple in the slave diet (Ferguson 1992:94). Africans prepared corn as hominy, pone, and mush, not unlike the starchy bases used in traditional West African cooking (Ferguson 1992:95). Although supplemented by garden vegetables and occasionally small pieces of meat, boiled together for hours on end (Ferguson 1992:94), corn was central to subsistence. Slaves typically received provisions once a week, which consisted of about three and a half to four pounds of meat and a peck of corn meal (Rivers 2000:128). Unfortunately, corn is not particularly nutritious and “African slaves… with their predilection for vegetarianism, their tendency to cook corn as mush or bread, and their limited rations, must have suffered nutritionally as this grain became a staple of their diet” (Ferguson 1992:95).

Over time, meat gained significance in the slave diet. Although domestic meat was in general an unreliable food source, pork became the most important domestic meat for slaves in the antebellum South (Ferguson 1992:96). In areas like coastal South Carolina and Georgia, as well as East Florida (Rivers 2000:129), that lacked pinelands for pig foraging and instead had extensive savannahs good for grazing, beef replaced pork in significance and slaves supplemented with hunting and fishing (Ferguson 1992:96). While the 1828 slave code prohibited possession of a firearm by bondservants, many Florida slaves still utilized guns for hunting, although the practice was more common in East and West Florida than Middle (Rivers 2000:131). Chickens were also a critical to the diet of many enslaved, providing regular protein in the form of eggs (Rivers 2000:130). Eggshell was recovered from the footprint of Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation, suggesting the presence of chickens at that site.

Despite the bountiful natural resources available in Florida, Maroons, free blacks, and slaves in the region were also active agriculturalists, many bringing key skills and experience
from Africa and Southern plantations to the fertile Florida environment. Nathaniel Millett (2013) argues that Florida Maroons, skilled in everything from animal husbandry to crop maintenance and irrigation, “may well have been better fed and healthier than they had been while enslaved” (Millett 2013:79). According to Horatio Dexter, a Rhode Island merchant who visited the site as a U.S. agent in 1823, at Peliklikaha, women were the primary domestic and agricultural laborers (Boyd 1958:88) and raised rice, beans, corn, and even oranges at the site (Weik 2012:140). Maroons at Peliklikaha also kept horses, cattle, and pigs and John Irwin, a soldier from a Tennessee company that helped destroy the town in 1836, noted that many houses in the town had beef curing in the rafters (Irwin 1836:33). Florida Maroons continued raising corn, yams, potatoes, and peas after fleeing to the Bahamas (Millett 2013:179).

Although traditionally, Native Americans ate much more meat than Africans (Ferguson 1992:94), meat provided a substantial portion of the maroon community’s diet. Maroons did not arrive in Florida empty handed; some even brought horses, cattle, and hogs with them when they escaped and according to historian Nathaniel Millett, Florida landowners even claimed “although with substantial degree of poetic license,” that the maroons at Prospect Bluff “possessed large herds of cattle and horses, which roam in the forests, gathering their food, both in summer and winter, without expense or trouble to their owners” (Millett 2013:179). Millett suggests that “more realistically, and much to the consternation of their owners, many of the region’s cattle were stolen and eaten by the Prospect bluff community” (Millett 2013:179). Although Florida had an abundance of wild resources, the natural environment did not provide Maroons with everything they needed and cattle and salt were common targets for maroon raiding and trading (Millett 2013:178). Escaping slavery did not mean isolation from the world economy (Weik 2012:113). Free and enslaved Africans had long been cowboys in the region, retrieving runaway
cattle for ranchers (Parker 2000) and cattle, both legally acquired and stolen became central to Maroon trade (Millett 2013:180). Both plantation overseers and traders paid Maroons at Peliklikaha for the return of runaway cattle and bought new animals from their herds (Mulroy 2007). Horatio Dexter (in Boyd 1958:92) notes that the Spanish sailors who visited coastal towns exchanged bayonets, muskets, bullets, gunpowder, lead, molasses, and rum for cattle (Weik 2012:142-143).

Seminole meals were not dissimilar from West African ones. Early travelers reported that Southeastern Indians always kept a pot of food on the fire simmering (Ferguson 1992:97) and in his writing on the Seminole, Chris MacCauley notes that “the kettle and the big spoon stand always ready for those who at any moment may hunger” (MacCauley 2000[1887]:506). This pot of food contained porridge or sofkee, a dish of ground hominy, rice or koonti, mixed with vegetables, like squash, and small pieces of meat. Everyone ate from the central kettle, serving sofkee with a spoon and selecting larger portions of meat with their hands or knife (MacCauley 2000[1887]:505).

Western Bias

Without completed faunal analysis, records like MacCauley’s (2000[1887]) are central to archaeologists’ conceptions of Maroon foodways. MacCauley, however, like most white men of his era, held strong prejudices against Native Americans and African Americans. Part of his purpose in listing all of the wild resources available to the Seminole in Florida is to question why they do not take better advantage of the natural bounty. At one point in his ethnography, MacCauley suggests that, “these Indians are not, of course, particularly provident… [but] they are beginning to be ambitious to increase their little herds of horses and cattle and their numbers of chickens and swine” (MacCauley 2000[1887]:504-505). The trader Horatio Dexter, who might be considered one of Florida Maroons’ greatest Euro-American allies, once “lamented the
‘idleness’ of the African Seminoles at Peliklikaha, and claimed that they only ‘occasionally’
hunted” (Weik 2012:140). Never mind that both bounty hunters and Euro-American militias
alike made a point to destroy Maroon crops and turn their livestock loose (Weik 2012:140).
Even military records of Maroon agriculture carry bias, as the exaggeration of Maroon holdings
would earn soldiers greater acclaim and encourage the supply of greater resources. Historical
narratives from the Underground Railroad mention that some people were re-enslaved because
they could not find enough food on the run (Chapman 1971) and Florida Maroons, like other
self-emancipated slaves likely worked hard to produce the food necessary to maintain their
freedom. The author intends to complete analysis of faunal remains from Peliklikaha in order to
build a less biased source of data on Maroon subsistence.

Personal Items

Buttons

Although personal items were found at each of the three sites, buttons were recovered
from only 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation. Twenty buttons and button fragments were
recovered from 71 Park Place and three buttons and button fragments were recovered from
Bulow Plantation. The buttons were evaluated using Stanley South’s (1964) typology and the
Digital Archaeology Archive’s Button Cataloging Manual (Aultman and Grillo 2012). A wide
variety of button types are represented, however, according to South’s typology, all of the
recovered buttons fit within an appropriate chronological range (South 1964:119).

At 71 Park Place, 21 buttons were recovered from 19th century contexts. These include
seven one-piece bone buttons, five of which are blanks with a single central hole (Type 15),
likely backing pieces from cloth buttons (Aultman and Grillo 2012:12; Beck 2006:48). Cloth
buttons were typically covered in fabric matching the article of clothing and dressmakers would
assemble them as needed (Marcel 1994:5). Unfortunately, cloth does not preserve well in
archaeological contexts so it difficult to know what these buttons looked like while in use. The
other two bone buttons are round with five holes (Type 19) and round with a mound-like shank
and tunnel eye (Type 14), respectively (Beck 2006:48). Bone buttons, often produced in the
home from cow or pig bone in the 17th, 18th, and early 19th centuries, range from ornately carved
to plain one piece disks (Marcel 1994:4). Plain bone buttons were often used in utilitarian
contexts and the two simple buttons likely came off of an undergarment, shirt, or pair of pants.

Seven of the recovered buttons were brass and pewter military buttons, which are discussed
below. The remaining metal buttons were all round, stamped brass buttons with attached shanks
(Type 18). One of the these round brass buttons has a diamond pattern etched into the domed
surface and another has the letters ‘LONDO’ curving around the shank, likely reflecting the
product’s British origins. All of the others are plain (Beck 2006:48).

One intact button and two button fragments were recovered from Bulow Plantation. The
button fragments were both bone, one had a single hole (Type 15) and the other had an unknown
number of holes and a convex rim (Type 19 or 20). Like the one-piece, single-hole buttons from
71 Park Place, the fragment recovered at Bulow Plantation may have been one component of a
multi-piece button. The fragment with a distinct rim is likely a simple utilitarian fastener. The
intact button, a brass, “Sanders Type,” button, is domed with a wire loop shank and may have
had a cloth covering at one point, however, the artifact is highly corroded (Richards 1984).
Sanders buttons were produced by riveting a wire shank into a metal back plate and folded the
edges of the front-piece over the back (Marcel 1994:9). Given its form and relatively small size,
this button may have come off of a waistcoat or a coat sleeve.

The button assemblages from each site reflect enslaved African and African American
people’s use of Euro-American style clothing. Slaves at Bulowville and the Hernandez orange
grove wore European style shirts, trousers, waistcoats, overcoats, and dresses, as did African slaves across the Americas who were quickly made to comply with European concepts of proper dress and decency (White and White 1995:151). Although European fabrics and clothing styles had been adopted quickly by African elites at the beginning of the slave trade, and had become status symbols by the mid-17th century (Thornton 1992:230-234), these clothes would have been unfamiliar to most newly arrived African slaves.

The typical slave wardrobe was fairly standardized, with slaves receiving the majority of their clothing from their masters. Clothing was generally distributed twice a year (Floyd Smith 1973:86); women received two or three dresses and two shifts and men received two shirts and two pairs of pants. Men and women would also typically receive a few handkerchiefs to be worn on the head, a single pair of tough leather shoes or “brogans”, and a woolen or straw hat depending on the season (Rivers 2000:136-138). Although occasionally slaves received an additional set of clothes or pair of shoes, slave owners, especially large plantation owners, preferred to keep clothing costs to a minimum to ensure maximum profits (Floyd Smith 1973:82,86). It was customary for slaves to go barefoot in the summer or even year-round in warmer climates (Floyd Smith 1973:86) and children went naked or in simple shirts or shifts and did not receive shoes until they started working (Rivers 2000:136).

Much contemporary knowledge about slave attire comes from the advertisements that slave-owners placed in an effort to retrieve runaway slaves. In many cases, the runaway’s attire was so ordinary (and the slave-owners dehumanized view of their slaves so complete), that clothing wasn’t even a primary identifier (White and White 1995:154). However, many other descriptions detail the clothing that slaves took with them when absconding. Runaway advertisements suggest that slaves typically had one or two changes of clothes and that they took
all of it with them when running to freedom (Rivers 2000:137). One woman named Eulalia who ran away from her master in St. Augustine “carried a large bundle of clothing of her own, consisting of some muslin, calico and checked homespun dresses, blankets, handkerchiefs, &c. Together with some utensils of blue Liverpool china” (Rivers 2000:137).

Eulalia’s wardrobe was a typical one, even her dress fabrics were ones commonly used for slave clothing. Florida slave owners bought muslin, lightweight cotton; kersey, a wool and cotton mixture; and osnaburg, a flax fabric for slaves everyday clothing and printed calico, a cotton fabric, for women’s Sunday dresses (Floyd Smith 1973:82). Although some states had laws dictating which materials were appropriate for slave clothing (White and White 1995:154), Florida slave masters were more likely guided by the demands of the semi-tropical climate. Sometimes slave owners ordered clothes from dry-goods merchants, but often slaves received used clothing or made their own. Although slave owners bought the materials, enslaved women sewed slaves’ wardrobes as well as mending and patching them and sometimes even processing the cotton and weaving the fabric themselves (Floyd Smith 1973:82-84; Rivers 2000:136). Young girls also participated in clothing production by knitting cotton and woolen stockings. By age seven a slave named Patience Campbell, “had begun to spin and weave light cotton material for use on the plantation” (Rivers 2000:137). Cotton planters were particularly reluctant to part with “hard cash for textiles and apparel which they could easily compel their slaves to produce” (White and White 1995:167) and during wartime, slaves across the contemporary United States were increasingly responsible for making their own clothing as normal trade was disrupted.

Although enslaved African and African American women produced European style garments, the emergent African-American aesthetic was not an imitation of Euro-American dress. While everyday slave clothing was relatively plain and utilitarian, “on Sundays and
holidays they usually look very smart” (F.L. Olmstead as quoted in Floyd Smith 1973:82).

Slaves, particularly in their Sunday dress, utilized a variety of materials and patterns, and frequently combined contrasting colors in a way “that jangled white sensibilities” (Wahlman 2001:35,48,110). Frederick Law Olmsted suggested that slaves took “a real pleasure, for instance, such as it is a rare thing for a white man to be able to feel, in bright and strongly contrasting colours” (as quoted in White and White 1995:169) and Fanny Kemble, the wife of a Georgia plantation owner referred to slaves’ Sunday clothes as, “the most ludicrous combination of incongruities that you can conceive… every color in the rainbow, and the deepest possible shades blended in fierce companionship” (Kemble 1975[1839]:93-4). Slaves also played with traditional European ensembles, combining articles of clothing and accessories in novel ways (White and White 1995:179).

African slaves invented out of necessity – corresponding suit pieces were undoubtedly hard to come by and dresses eventually needed mending, regardless of the availability of matching cloth – but also drew on African textile and clothing traditions. Robert Farris Thompson characterizes the textile traditions of West Africa as having a “visual aliveness,” achieved by the combination of vibrant colors and patterns in “rhythmized textiles” (1984:209-210). In West Africa, these vivid colors and design patterns were symbols for social status, as the bold and contrasting colors allowed wearers to be ‘read’ from a distance, and wealth, as only the wealthy could afford such elaborate fabrics (Wahlman 2001:35,48,110). In the Americas, Africans and African descendents utilized European style products to re-imagine an African aesthetic that lent them visual and cultural power.

Spindle-Whorl and Buckle

However, the emergent African-American aesthetic was not simply the expression of African ideals through European items, it also involved transformation of the production process
and challenging of the master-slave relationship. In the antebellum south, clothes making was the near exclusive domain of women. Male slaves made shoes and occasionally hats, however, women were responsible for the bulk of local textile and clothing production (White and White 1995:172). On the other hand, in the Mande “country cloth”, Asante and Ewe “kente” traditions, and many other strip weaving traditions found across West Africa, weaving was the province of men (Gilfoy 1988:11). Joining narrow strips of woven fabric together produced vibrant color-blocked textiles and although women participated in processing the raw materials, producing thread, and dying; strip weaving on horizontal looms was done solely by men (Thompson 1983:208-209). Women were the primary producers of other African textiles, such as the Igbo “akwete” cloth; however, the strict gender division of textile production in the Americas was a new phenomenon. Although narrow strip weaving did appear in the New World, its spread was limited to coastal Brazil (Thompson 1983:212-213). In other regions women produced cloth on large vertical looms. These women incorporated West African principles of design by weaving stripes and checked patterns into larger pieces of cloth (White and White 1995:170). Women also dyed the threads used to produce patterns, likely relying on past dying experience (White and White 1995:167). Stripes had long been a part of the West African textile tradition; blue and white striped cloth, dating from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, has been recovered from archaeological contexts at Tellem sites in central Mali (Thompson 1983:208-209); and stripes, along with color-blocking and the combination of vibrant colors and prints continues to characterize the African American quilting tradition today (Thompson 1983:214-217; Wahlman and Scully 1990).

A spindle whorl recovered from Cabin 3 at Bulow Plantation suggests that cabin’s inhabitants were indeed producing their own cloth and may have been using African technology
to do so. The spindle whorl is donut shaped, about 4 cm tall and 8 cm wide with a single square hole in the center, possibly made using a cut nail. At the Howell site near Columbia, South Carolina, Mark Groover, recovered a similar artifact from an earthfast, sixteen by sixteen foot, one room cabin with a pit-cellar full of colonoware (Groover 1994). An inventory kept by the planter notes the presence of spinning wheels and looms at the site (Groover 1994:58) and evidence of European textile traditions were recovered archaeologically, however, the carinated spindle whorl, about 8 cm tall and 12 cm wide, suggests that African spinning techniques were also practiced at the plantation (Groover 1994:52). Groover argues that the artifact’s resemblance to West African spindle whorls and “negative historical and ethnographic evidence” for Native American and Euro-American use of spindle whorls in the colonial Southeast confirm the object’s African American production origins (Groover 1994:52). Given the similarity of the whorl from Cabin 3 to that from the Howell plantation, it can also be interpreted as an African-style whorl.

The use of African textile technology fits well in the tradition of fabric production on plantations. Spindle whorls were used to produce flax, cotton, and wool thread (Picton and Mack 1979:23, 27, 30), the materials most commonly used in fabrics intended for slave use. Additionally, West African examples are typically made out of clay, pottery often being the domain of women in West Africa (Groover 1994). Although we cannot be sure of the object’s gendered association, it makes sense that African spindle technology would be transferred to the colonies through women, as women were the predominant producers of homemade cloth and clothing in the colonial world.

While the production of cloth and clothing was a yet another burden for slave women, it also enabled them to shape their visual appearance in a way that differentiated them from white
society (White and White 1995:173). The division between white and black in colonial America was typically defined by whites, however, through the production of textiles and the development of a unique African-American fashion aesthetic, slaves took ownership of their black identity. Additionally, despite their legal status, many slaves incorporated elite symbols in their clothing, including military jackets, feathered hats, gold lace, silver shoe buckles, and silk stockings (White and White 1995:154-164). While everyday shoes were simple leather constructions, the existence of an iron shoe buckle fragment (Beck 2006:48) at 71 Park Place suggests that a slave living at the orange grove had a second pair of shoes with dress buckles, much like those worn by St. Augustine’s wealthier classes. Shoe buckles and silk stockings were not adopted to embrace white values, but rather subvert white authority, much like the cakewalk dance performed by slaves in mocking imitation of their owners. Although white slave masters did necessarily recognize resistance as inherent to African-American clothing and fashion, they did express their discomfort and displeasure when slaves challenged their social positions with clothing. When a slave named Erskyne from “Guiney Country” ran away from a South Carolina plantation in 1773, his owner described his clothing as “really too good for any of his Colour” (as quoted in White and White 1995:160). Enslaved people challenged the social order of colonial society by adopting clothing and adornment deemed to be above their status.

**Military Buttons**

A number of military buttons and a fragment of a decorative tassel were also recovered from 71 Park Place. The single tassel cord tip was identified as decoration from a kind of US Army military cap known as a “shako,” worn in the early 19th century. Three of the recovered buttons were identified as US Army overcoat buttons. The domed brass buttons feature an eagle, wreath, and the letters ‘US’ on top and on the underside, stars and the words ‘United States’ are arranged around the shank fastener; this pattern can be dated to 1820 military issues. One US
artillery cuff button, essentially a smaller version of the overcoat buttons but without writing, was also recovered as well as two misshapen, four-holed, pewter buttons which likely came from army issued breeches and date somewhere between 1812 and 1840 (Beck 2006:50).

As noted above, military regalia was one form of elite symbolism which slaves incorporated into their fashion. Dick “a stout elderly Angola fellow” ran away in December 1771 wearing a coat and trousers made of plain blue cloth, but also wore a red soldier’s jacket (White and White 1995:164). Elite and military items were paired with lower quality items in ways that may have made white society baulk but fit seamlessly with the emergent African-American aesthetic, which placed value on vibrancy and visual contrast.

It is entirely possible that the slaves at 71 Park Place incorporated military regalia into their formal or even daily attire. Martin Hernández left Florida for Cuba in 1817. However, his son Joseph remained in the territory, took control of his father’s properties, and quickly gained social and political status. Joseph Hernandez served as a delegate to Florida’s first Legislative Council and, eventually, as a Florida delegate in the US Congress (Linville 2004:12). He also served as head commander of the East Florida militia in the Second Seminole War and was responsible for the protection of all East Florida citizens (Beck 2006:50; Linville 2004:20). Hernandez may have gifted US military issued clothing to the slaves tending the grove during the Second Seminole War, or, he may have allowed US soldiers (possibly even the same men who occupied Bulow Plantation), who inevitably lost a few uniform buttons, to camp on the grove as it was in a good strategic position for the city’s defense (Beck 2006:51-52).

One final military button, cannot be so easily linked to Joseph Hernandez however. A single disk shaped brass button recovered from the site is decorated with a crown and the letters ‘RP.’ The letters refer to the ‘Royal Provincials’, British Loyalists who fought on behalf of
England during the Revolutionary War (Beck 2006:52). Florida, the “14th colony,” remained loyal to England and many Tories fled to the region during and after the war. Although the East Florida militia units, which included four companies of former slaves, were never fully active, it is possible that other loyalist soldiers may have camped on the land shortly before Martin Hernandez received his grant or that one of the slaves managing the grove acquired the button from a Loyalist following Florida’s return to Spain.

Although no military buttons were recovered at Peliklikaha, archaeological, historical, and cultural evidence suggest that Seminole wore uniform coats and jackets, with military buttons, as well. The Seminole adopted and adapted these military symbols in order to convey a message of strength to their enemies (Weisman 2000:311). Although the Seminole continued more traditional Creek methods of clothing manufacture using deer and other animal skins, they also utilized commercially manufactured fabrics, including calico, cotton, gingham, and flannel (MacCauley 2000[1887]:483) and produced Euro-American style pants, shirts, and dresses. However, like enslaved peoples, Seminoles did not merely adopt European style clothing, they transformed it. Women’s clothing, for example, utilized long European-style skirts but paired them with blouses that exposed the midriff and dozens of brightly colored glass bead necklaces. Unlike enslaved women, the Seminole never produced their own fabrics (MacCauley 2000[1887]:517), however, they did adapt European clothing forms to fit their needs and aesthetics. In the 18th and 19th century, Seminoles decorated their clothing with strips of cloth or beading, eventually giving way to the patchwork style, made possible by the adoption of the sewing machine, that characterized Seminole clothing in the early 20th century (Weisman 2000:305).
Many Maroons living in close proximity with the Seminole adopted similar clothing styles. However, a few consistent differences existed. Maroon men, for the most part, preferred to wear pants instead of leggings, and hats or turbans instead of headbands (Larose 2014:90). Unfortunately, little is known about Maroon women or children’s dress. However, given the central role of slave women to fabric and clothing production on plantations, it is likely that Maroon women had the skills to produce their own fabric and turn that fabric into clothing. It is likely that Maroon women directly influenced the evolution of Seminole dress.

**Metal Cone**

A single metal cone was recovered at Peliklikaha and suggests strong links between Maroon and Seminole patterns of personal adornment, which were in turn influenced by African jewelry and personal adornment. As discussed above, the Seminole wore European style clothing, but adapted it to fit their practical and cultural needs, including making decorative additions. The Seminole costume had a number of recognizable components, including bird plumes and silver gorgets, which immediately identified the wearer as a member of the tribe while also allowing for the expression of individual status and personality (Weisman 1989:21). Seminole leaders such as Osceola are often pictured wearing some combination of turban, ostrich plumes, silver gorgets and earrings, bracelets or arm bands, beaded sashes and garters, and bead necklaces (Johnson 1976:94). British trade inventories include “silver earbobs”, and both teardrop and cone shaped earbobs, like that recovered at Peliklikaha, have been documented in Seminole burials at Fort Brooke (Weisman 1989:67). A number of scholars have drawn connections between the Seminole’s characteristically showy personal adornments and the influence of their African allies. Jewelry typically associated with African slaves includes “bead and brass-wire earrings, beaded armbands, silver and gold ear bobs and drops, [and] iron-ring bracelets” (Rivers 2000:170) many of which are common Seminole adornments as well. The
argument for influence of African beading traditions on Seminole beadwork, as discussed above, is robust and Seminole armbands and bracelets were far more similar to African jewelry than Creek (Larose 2014:91).

However, not all of the connections drawn between Seminole and African adornment are so substantial. MacCauley’s 1887 survey of the tribe noted that Seminole women often decorated their dresses with pendant disks, made from silver coins. Some have connected this practice, in which clothes are essentially decorated with money, to African decorative traditions using cowry shells, which was used as a form of currency prior to colonization in some areas of West and Central Africa, however the connection is tenuous (Larose 2014:91). As for the origin of the conical earbob, while African certainly wore earrings, this particular form may have more directly Native American beginnings. While metalworking has a long-tradition in West-African societies, Native Americans in the Southeast also had experience working metal. Copper had long been smelted and worked by a variety of Southeastern tribes and during the 18th century, Calusa artisans used Spanish coins to construct geometrical pendants and beads (Johnson 1976:93-104). Additionally, hoop earrings, not cones, were most popular among slaves, and were purported to have protective and curative properties (Foster 1998). Many Florida runaways, both men and women, are described as wearing simple metal rings in one, or both, ears (Rivers 2000:170-171). However, teardrop earrings were popular amongst both groups.

The presence of a metal cone at Peliklikaha substantiates historical descriptions of Maroons in Seminole dress and decoration, and raises the question of visual influence. Although it is unlikely that Africans introduced silver cone earrings to the Seminole, it is possible that an African or African-American aesthetic of personal presentation influenced the 18th and 19th century Seminole costume. Enslaved African Americans used jewelry for beautification, but
also as a marker of prestige (Foster 1998; Weik 2002:125), much like the Seminole use of jewelry for the purpose of marking group and personal identity.

The use of jewelry as a protective entity amongst enslaved Africans and African Americans has also been documented, as in the case of pierced coin charms (Davidson 2004, 2010). However, no items of jewelry or protective charms were recovered from the two plantation sites, other than beads from Bulow Plantation. A single 1803 Spanish real was recovered from one of the external pits at 71 Park Place, but the coin lacks any significant marks, such as Xs or holes, that would suggest its use as a charm.

**Beads**

Beads were recovered at two of the three sites in the comparison. Four glass beads have been collected from Pilaklikaha (Weik 2002). One black glass bead was recovered in Jordan Herron’s 1993 surface survey of the site (1994:64) and three beads; one green, one blue faceted, and one clear faceted; were recovered in the excavations directed by Terry Weik at the site in 2000 and 2001. Seven glass beads were recovered from Cabin 1 on Bulow Plantation. One spherical black bead with a matte surface was recovered in the yard to the east of the cabin. The other six beads were recovered from the eastern edge of the cabin and include three spherical beads in aquamarine and blue, two long cylindrical blue beads and two clear or frosted white faceted beads. No beads were recovered from 71 Park Place.

By the time of European contact, beads had been in use across the African continent for thousands of years (Stine, Cabak, and Groover 1996:53-55; Weik 2002:121). Beads were used to adorn everything from hair and clothing to musical instruments and were found in both secular and sacred contexts (Farris Thompson 1984:93; Stine et al 1996). Glass beads, from Venice, found their way to African buyers through a thriving system of international trade and are found on archaeological sites across the continent (Stahl 1999; Weik 2012:121). These beads, besides
being used for adornment, were also commonly utilized as amulets and charms in Central and West Africa (Davidson 2004:31) although different cultural groups had different preferences for bead types and colors (Stine et al. 1996:53-54). In Nigeria, special beads, referred to as *Ilekes*, were used to signify a connection with divine forces (Adediran 1998:7) and archaeologists cite many ethnographic examples of beads being used to insure success or protect from harm (Davidson 2004:31; Stine et al. 1996:54-55). Tying a string with single bead around a child’s waist was a widespread West African charm and in Kongo philosophy, kept the child’s soul healthy and “round” (Stine et al. 1996:55). While Africans had many uses and meanings for beads, even within a single cultural group (DeCorse 1997), their widespread use and general social significance is undeniable.

Africans continued utilizing glass beads in the Americas and these beads have been found on various plantations and African American burial sites in the United States (Davidson 2015; Otto 1984; Singleton 1990; Stine et al. 1996; Weik 2002). Historical documents and photographs also document the use of beads by African and African-American people (Foster 1998). These sources point to the particular importance of blue beads as objects of symbolical and spiritual significance. Archaeologists Linda Stine, Melanie A. Cabak, and Mark D. Groover (1996), suggest that the color blue was popular given its significance in various West African religions. One 19th century traveler’s account notes that slaves in Iboland made blue beads themselves (Northrup 1972:222) and another reference to the color blue is made in a 20th century study of the Igala tribe, who, if the family can afford the expense, bury the dead with blue necklaces (Seton 1930:153), however, specific colors are rarely mentioned in ethnographic sources (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:108).
Furthermore, archaeology is unable to determine the source of every artifact. If slaves only acquired beads as hand-me-downs or gifts from planters, or as stolen objects, the color blue is no longer clearly an African choice (Kelso 1984: 190,201). Additionally, two bead catalogs from the late 19th century suggest that manufacturer’s offered a greater variety of blues, blue-greens, and greens than other colors, which could be the result of consumer preference, or merely a reality of glass manufacturing (Stine et al. 1996:55). Nonetheless, the conclusion reached by Stine, Cabak, and Groover (1996) is supported by the subsequent recovery of blue beads on sites like Kingsley Plantation, where other evidence of African religious practices exist and slave agency is well-documented historically (Davidson 2015; Davidson and McIlvoy 2012).

Beads were also used widely by Native American groups and glass beads were a popular trading item in colonial America (Stine et al. 1996:56-58). Stine et al. (1996:56) report that traders would often complain to their suppliers if they received the wrong color blankets or beads as their Native American customers were selective customers and William Byrd once wrote to merchants Perry and Lane with the complaint that he had been sent large white beads instead of small. Archaeological studies of Eastern Woodlands tribes reflect this selective consumerism, demonstrating that Native American groups had strong color and shape preferences when purchasing beads (Smith 1983:151). In the Northeast, colonial sites are dominated by red beads but in the Chesapeake blue and white-striped beads are far more common (Miller 1983:133).

The Creek and Seminoles also developed bead preferences over time. In a 1734 portrait Tomochachi, a Lower Creek chief, is depicted with a fur cape tied around his neck. His bare chest displays elaborate tattoos, markers for clan affiliation, social status, and political power but he is not wearing beads of any kind (Larose 2014:91). Southern tribes, including the Creek and Cherokee, had not yet incorporated beads into their clothing in the 18th century (Larose 2014:91).
However, in the 19th century Creeks and Seminoles began to use beads as personal adornment and to embellishment on clothing (Downs 1995:166-167; Goggin 1951). As the Seminole moved into Florida and adopted European style long-shirt, which protected against both insects and sun exposure, beaded sashes, bands, and garters became popular. Beaded designs displayed wealth and status, compensating for the elaborate tattoos that the long shirt covered (Larose 2014:92). Chris MacCauley’s (2000[1887]:488) volume on the Seminole notes their preference for blue glass beads:

It seems to be the ambition of the Seminole squaws to gather about their necks as many strings of beads as can be hung there and as they can carry. They are particular as to the quality of the beads they wear. They are satisfied with nothing meaner than a cut glass bead, about a quarter of an inch or more in length, generally of some shade of blue.

These blue beads appear archaeologically as well. Blue and white faceted beads dominate Oklahoma Creek assemblages from the late 19th and early 20th century while a wide variety of blue beads are recovered from Alabama and Georgia sites from the same era (Good 1983:160,162). Blue beads also dominate Seminole sites from the 1830s (Weisman 1989): “glass beads are not common at the presumed earliest sites but are very numerous on sites dating to the nineteenth century… the abundance of glass beads and other trade items… is a hallmark of the British and Second Spanish (1763-1821) periods, when economic interactions between Seminoles and colonists were most intense” (Weisman 2000:303; Weisman 1989:59-81). Faceted blue beads were recovered at Weekiwachee, the Fort Brooke Cemetery, and the Nicholson Grove sites (Weisman 1989:87).

The earliest description of Seminole beadwork is from William Bartram’s 1791 Travels in which Bartram describes a Seminole Long Warrior’s headband; a “very curious diadem or band, about four inches broad, and ingeniously wrought or woven, and curiously decorated with stones beads, wampum, porcupine quills, etc.” (Bartram 1791:393). Thomas Larose (2014:93) argues
that Seminole beadwork designs, and their subsequent variations, are “best understood by considering the escaped African slaves living among them.” African born slaves continued to arrive in Florida and the southern United States legally, and then illegally, until the Civil War and Larose suggests that West African beadwork traditions and Central African scarification traditions “likely played a large role in influencing the technical and stylistic changes seen in Seminole beadwork beginning in the 1820s” (Larose 2014:94).

Early Seminole beadwork designs included chevrons, diamonds, lightning bolts, and sawtooth patterns, all very different from traditional Southeastern tattoos of animals, flowers, crescents, stars, scrolls, and suns (Larose 2014:93). African born individuals with scarification were seen in Florida as late as 1890 and Larose suggests that diamond and weaving scarification patterns, prevalent amongst Central African groups at the time, would have appeared on many Maroon bodies. Those patterns were adopted and adapted by their Seminole allies as a means of simultaneously separating their identity from the Creek and tying it the Africans (Larose 2014:94).

Larose (2014) asserts that the origin of Seminole beadworking techniques also has African origin, but it tied to West African traditions rather than Central African ones. Although it has been suggested that the skill was brought to the Seminole from the Cherokees, who Moravian missionaries taught embroidery in the 1800s, this seems implausible given the distance and political divisions as well as the stylistic and technical differences between the two crafts (Larose 2014:95). The Yoruba and other groups from the Bight of Benin had an extensive beadwork tradition whose influence is still visible today in the handcrafts of various Caribbean and Brazilian cultures (Farris Thompson 1984) and, Larose (2014:96) argues:

the influx of Yoruba and related groups of escaped Africans into Seminole territory during the 1820s undoubtedly brought technical knowledge for embroidered
beadworking, practiced by the Yoruba for centuries. In transmission of technical skills of embroidery to Seminoles, Yoruba symbolism and ritual associations were likewise passed on, adopted and adapted into the Seminole conception of beadwork.

Although beads were used to decorate finger-woven items beginning in the late 1700s, beadwork does not appear on commercial fabrics until around 1820, approximately the same time that the Spanish ceded Florida to the United States and the Black Seminole alliance became more critical. This transition is evident in the evolution of the Seminole shoulder or bandoleer bag. The bandoleer bag, a common item in the Seminole wardrobe by the 1800s, was actually adopted from the British shot pouch and was used to hold shot and tobacco (Larose 2014:94). The bags, originally made from finger woven fabrics transitioned to commercial wool fabrics with curvilinear and geometric designs, similar to Yoruba designs used on ritual paraphernalia bags, in the 1810s and 1820s (Larose 2014:95-96). That was also when the bandoleer came to be used as more than a utilitarian pouch, but also as a container for ritual items (Larose 2014:97).

Before the Seminole Wars, Seminole religious practitioners housed the towns’ sacred items in centralized bundles, but with militarization and dispersal, sacred bundles were divided among group leaders to give each group “Power of War” medicines (Downs 1995:163).

**Tobacco**

Evidence of tobacco use was present at each of the three sites, although in varying degrees. Forty-six clay pipe fragments were recovered at 71 Park Place, representing almost 3% of the total assemblage at that site. Twenty-two of those fragments are bowls and bowl fragments of various sizes. Sixteen of the bowls are undecorated and six have straight or curved line molding on the exterior, all are made out of white, kaolin clay (Beck 2006:45), suggesting that they are English imports. Eight pipe fragments were recovered from Peliklikaha including a ridged bowl fragment and a pipe stem with attached bowl base that resemble pipes of American
origin made in the late 18th and throughout the 19th century, possibly at Pamplin (Noel-Hume 1970; Weik 2002:126). At Bulow Plantation, only three pipe fragments have been recovered in three years of excavation, all made of white kaolin clay. Two decorated pipe stems, one nearly complete, were recovered from Cabin 3 in the most recent field season and one bowl fragment, undecorated and without a maker’s mark was recovered from Cabin 1.

Clay smoking pipes are commonplace on domestic sites throughout the contemporary United States, from the 17th century through the early 20th (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:109). Clay pipes were extremely cheap and used by Anglo-American colonists and slaves alike (Noel Hume 1969:296), and are recovered from practically all excavated slave cabins, suggesting a “penschant for pipe-smoking” (Otto 1984:76). Spanish colonists, on the other hand, preferred to smoke cigars, making clay pipe fragments rare on Spanish colonial sites (Beck 2006:47; Deagan 2002:310).

Given these patterns, one might expect that the 71 Park Place habitation, located close to a Spanish town, would have fewer pipes and Cabin 1 at Bulow, owned by an Anglo-planter, would have more. Instead, pipe fragments are plentiful at 71 Park Place and nearly absent at Bulow Plantation. The existence of so many pipes at the Hernandez orange grove is much easier to explain than the lack of pipes at Bulow; by the 19th century, St. Augustine was a cosmopolitan city, not a Spanish military post. The city’s inhabitants came from across the Atlantic world and had access to goods from all over the world. Like the ubiquitous English ceramics, English mass-produced pipes made their way into the material record at 71 Park Place. However, it is this pervasive nature of clay pipes that makes their scarcity at Bulow Plantation all the more unusual. The inhabitants of Cabin 1 may have discarded their tobacco waste in the nearby creek, however, just as unintentionally broken pots, dropped animal bones, and broken tools are
recovered archaeologically, one might expect to find a few missed pipe stems around a site occupied for over a decade. The most likely reason for the lack of pipes in the archaeological record is a lack of pipes at the site to begin with. Whether because the inhabitants of the cabin chose not to smoke or because they did not have access to tobacco and smoking paraphernalia is unclear. John Joachim Bulow was a cruel slave master, but historical records suggest that Francis Pellicer, the plantation overseer, was the man in charge. It may be that Pellicer, the son of Minorcan immigrants, introduced the slaves to cigars or that a less durable material was used to make pipes at the site. However, given the low cost of kaolin pipes, the low count of pipe fragments at Bulow simply does not make sense.

Like ceramics, Maroons acquired tobacco and smoking pipes through a variety of means. Gift lists kept by the British government at St. Augustine document their attempts to attract Native American military allies and trading partners with a variety of goods including tobacco (Covington 1960). The Spanish did the same, sometimes with the help of the Patton and Leslie trading company (Weik 2002:126) and pipe stems have been recovered from the Oven Hill site on the Suwannee River and from a number of Seminole sites in Alachua County (Sears 1959; Weisman 1989). The Alachua Seminole are mentioned specifically in one 18th century gift list, as are Cimarrones (Weik 2002:126-127). They also likely grew their own tobacco, as many individuals had experience growing the crop on plantations, and acquired pipes through independent traders. Tobacco was a central component of the Maroon militant’s wardrobe as they kept the product in their bandoleer bags alongside shot and other essential items (Larose 2014:94).

Firearms and Ammunition

Despite the central place of defense and warfare in the Maroon experience, very little evidence of weapon use exists at the site, especially compared to the assemblage from Bulow
At Peliklikaha just one piece of lead waste and two pieces of lead shot, both different sizes, were recovered. This stands in contrast to the common perception of Maroons as armed militants. Many Maroons were formally trained, whether by the Spanish or the British, (Millett 2013:149) and took part in black regiments like the Fifth West India Regiment, the Spanish pardo and Moreno militia (Millett 2013:149). Arms were among the items gifted to Maroon and Seminole leaders by the Spanish and British governments (Weik 2002:127). Additionally, in the 18th and 19th centuries, Maroon leaders across the Americas took military titles, such as captain, governor, or colonel, reflecting the necessity of militarization on the part of Maroon communities (Millett 2013:196). Armed conflict is rightfully considered a key aspect of Maroon life.

However, we also know that the occupants of Peliklikaha had evacuated the site long before the arrival of General Eustis and his troops. It may be that warfare, although playing a central role in Maroon freedom was something to be avoided. The low numbers of lead shot recovered from Peliklikaha are a reminder that Maroons did not typically seek out conflict, but were rather hunted as escaped slaves, attacked as supposed agents of mass rebellion, pushed out of land claimed by white settlers, and moved to take up arms for their own defense. Florida Maroons certainly used weapons in raiding and hunting; however, the archaeological record at Peliklikaha seems to suggest that not all Maroons were engaged in military action.

The highest number of arms related artifacts were recovered from Bulow Plantation. Two gunflints, eight copper percussion caps, 43 pieces of lead shot, and numerous pieces of lead sprue were recovered from Cabin 1 in the 2014 and 2015 field seasons. The two recovered gunflints are small, dark grey, and the appropriate size for a pistol or pocket pistol rather than a long gun. The eight percussion caps are small, likely from a pistol, not a musket, and seem to
have been fired on site. The many pieces of lead shot represent a variety of standardized sizes and many are deformed (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016: 82-86), suggesting that they have been fired. The lead sprue may be the by-product of casting bullets, however, sprue is common in enslaved context in the United States and may also be waste from fishing weights or any other lead object (Davidson 2007; Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:82,93).

At 71 Park Place, a much smaller assemblage of arms related artifacts were recovered. Six pieces of lead shot, all buck-ball sized, and one possible gunflint were collected from 19th century contexts (Beck 2006:52). The buck-balls are all perfectly spherical and likely unfired. The lithic artifact and possible gunflint is light grey in color and wedge shaped. Gunflints on colonial American sites typically come from either England or France (Beck 2006:52). French gunflints, honey colored and wedge shaped, dominate colonial and Revolutionary sites but by the early 19th century only English gunflints, light grey and trapezoidal in shape, are available to the American public (Noel Hume 1969:220). The Bulow gunflint is clearly English in origin, however, the possible gunflint at 71 Park Place appears French in shape but English in color. At this point its origins are unclear (Beck 2006:52).

The presence of firearms at the two plantation sites may reflect both the illegal arming of slaves and the military presence in East Florida during the Second Seminole War. Although it was technically illegal to arm slaves in most European colonies, archaeologists have recovered evidence of slaves’ access to guns at a number of plantation sites (Ascher and Fairbanks 1971; Fairbanks 1984; Otto 1984). Slaves typically used guns for hunting wild game, however, some slave owners may have also armed their slaves for defense purposes. In Spanish East Florida, firearms granted slaves access to deer and ducks, but also protected them from Native American attacks and even invading U.S. citizens. The black militia was a critical component of St.
Augustine’s defense system against the numerous attacks. Joseph Hernandez, as leader of the East Florida militia, would have been especially cognizant of the benefits of arming slaves. It is very possible that the residents of 71 Park Place were armed for their defense.

It is less likely that the slaves at Bulow Plantation were armed, however, given John Joachim Bulow’s brutality (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:93). While Pellicer ran day-to-day operations, Bulow still had ultimate authority over the plantation and it is unlikely that he would have armed his slaves, fearing retaliation for the murder of three of their peers. It is more likely that the gunflints, percussion caps, and shot were deposited at the site during the military occupation of December 1835. Both Pellicer and Hernandez attested to the troops use of the cabins (U.S. Senate 1839a: Public Document No. 129, page 2-3, 11) and the great variety of ammunition suggests the presence of a number of different guns. Furthermore, the small size of the gunflints and percussion caps point to the presence of small, personal pistols, not the shotguns used by hunters. While some of the lead shot may be from a shotgun, these pieces could have been removed from a dead animal during processing. While the lead shot and possible gunflint at 71 Park Place may also be evidence of military occupation, much like the buttons and tassel recovered there, the consistent size and low numbers of ammunition suggest that a single unused weapon was present on the site, rather than the multiple fired weapons present at Cabin 1.

**Slate Writing Fragments**

Five fragments of thin gray slate were recovered from Cabin 1 at Bulow Plantation and likely represent a small writing tablet. Although slate was often used for roofing and flooring in the 19th century, archival descriptions of the slave cabins specifically note the structures’ wooden floors and wooden shingle roofs (U. S. Senate 1839: claim 129, page 11). Additionally, while architectural materials are well preserved and plentiful, only these five small slate fragments
were recovered. The only other possible use for the slate would have been a writing tablet and
the presence of a small, incised line on one of the fragments supports this conclusion (Davidson
and Ibarrola 2016:110). The slate tablet may have been used for drawing or belonged to one of
the soldiers stationed at Bulow in 1835, however, it is distinctly possible that a slave at Bulow
Plantation was using the tablet to learn to read and write.

While literacy was rare among Africans and African Americans in the early 19th century,
excavation has uncovered slate from other enslaved plantation contexts as well (Zierden et al.
1999; Butler et al. 2013:186; Naglich et al. 2004:231), and we know that some slaves did learn to
read, write, and do math. Children often picked up basic skills from their white playmates
(Frederick Douglass learned to read this way) and some slave owners ignored the law and chose
to teach slaves to read for practical purposes. Many urban dwelling slaves were taught to read
and write so that they might be helpful running a store or managing a business (Rivers 2000 78-
79). For some reason, it was particularly common for West Florida slave owners to teach slaves
reading, writing, and basic math, and one plantation owner explained that it helped his slaves
“better conduct the mechanical and commercial aspects of the business” (Rivers 2000:149). The
residents of 71 Park Place may also have been literate, upward of 15% of slaves had gained at
least basic proficiency in reading and writing before emancipation (Rivers 2000:150).

Of course, literacy was so uncommon amongst slaves not only because it was illegal to
teach enslaved people to read and write, but also because literacy threatened the entire system of
slavery. Literacy gave slaves access to privileged information. Although there were few laws
against slave education in the 18th century (Bly 2008), illegalization occurred quickly when the
American Anti-Slavery Society began distributing abolitionist literature throughout the South in
1835 (Wright 1836; Starling 1988:15-20). Literacy also gave slaves power. Literate slaves were
enabled to forge manumission papers (Franklin and Schweninger 1999:230-231) and countless ads for runaway slaves note that the individual is “very intelligent,” that they can read and write “and will probably forge passes for himself” or have already made “a false certificate of liberty” (Rivers 2000:216-217). Dissatisfied slaves, those who pretended to be happy, slaves who had previously been hired out or had special skills, and those who could read or write were often placed under close supervision (Franklin and Schweninger 1999:259).

Within Florida Maroon society, literacy was highly valued as it enabled communication and negotiation with outsiders (Millett 2013:170). However, this was not always the case with Maroon societies. According to historian Nathaniel Millett, “most maroon communities were nonliterate societies in which education was practical and not academic” (2013:169). The Florida Maroons, on the other hand, placed the well-educated in positions of power. Two of the leaders of the Maroon force at Prospect Bluff, Cyrus and Prince, were chosen specifically for their literacy and medical knowledge, respectively. A number of Florida Maroons served as interpreters for the Seminole, including Gopher John and Cudjoe; and Abraham, after whom Abraham’s Old Town is named, served as an interpreter for both the Seminole and the U.S. government (Littlefield 1977). Abraham’s ability to read treaties and relay their contents to Seminole leaders was pivotal in U.S.-Seminole relations. A Florida traveler named William Haynes Simmons noted that the Maroons were “much smarter than their [Indian] owners,” likely referring to the Maroons mastery of many languages (as quoted in Millett 2013:170) and Maroon refugees in the Bahamas established a school with one of their own as instructor in the few months before their settlement was discovered by the Bahamian authorities (Millett 2013:170). Literacy enabled slaves to escape and remained a key tool by which self-liberated individuals maintained their freedom.
CHAPTER 6
RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

This thesis seeks to answer three primary questions: (1) What are the basic material differences and similarities between the various sites under investigation and what can these comparisons tell us about daily life at each site? (2) Are historically recognized patterns of resistance visible in the material record and how do they differ between sites? And (3) to what extent is ethnogenesis evident at each of the sites, and what form does it take? In order to address these questions, analysis looked at four categories of material from the three sites: architecture, ceramics, faunal, and personal, the final category including a variety of items from clothing and items of personal adornment to tobacco and firearms. Ultimately, analysis suggested that Maroon and slave lives were fundamentally similar, with both groups forming novel ethnic identities through everyday decisions, but that differing resistance practices did shape each group in particular ways.

Although field methods at the three sites differed, and cataloging and processing were performed separately and slightly differently for each site, it is possible to make a number of cross-site comparisons in order to get at daily life and basic material patterning. While architecture and site layout vary dramatically across the three sites, all seem to demonstrate the uninhibited fusion of cultural forms and practices that occurred in the colonial world. The cabins, all built in different styles with different materials and located within settings that range from relative isolation to a strictly organized arc, defy patterning. The great variability in number of tobacco related items also suggest that daily life varied from site to site, particular in relation to Euro-American control and access to consumer goods. Analysis of ceramic types also suggests the significance of market access in shaping a site materially, however, ceramics forms
suggest that regardless of location or legal status, Africans in Florida maintained relatively similar foodways, with all of the sites reflecting a heavy dependence on hollowwares. Faunal materials from 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation, and historical sources on Maroon life, suggest that inhabitants of all three sites utilized a mixture of both wild and domestic resources, but that the specific proportions differed from site to site. Personal items such as buttons, buckles, and beads offer a glimpse into dress and personal adornment, but ultimately, it is difficult to make comparisons from site to site given the relatively small size of the collections. Finally, remnants of military clothing and firearms are a reminder that war and violence were significant factors at all three sites.

The material record at the three sites in some ways confirms our preconceived notions about resistance in the colonial world and in other ways challenges them. Several small pieces of slate found at Bulow Plantation reflect the common yet subversive acts of reading and writing. Meanwhile, the spindle whorl recovered from the same site reflects the need for clothing, but also the potentially resistive nature of mundane tasks like textile production. The subfloor pit at Bulow Plantation also seems to strongly suggest resistance, but that assumption is contradicted by the fact that the pit is nearly completely empty. Similarly, Peliklikaha’s location within the landscape is suggestive of resistance, but the well-constructed town may not have been as inaccessible as we think, and the paucity of ammunition and firearms at that site leaves us to question if Maroons’ militant resistance took the form that we often assume it did. Certain types of ceramics also challenge our conception of Maroon resistance; in particular, the presence of European ceramics at Peliklikaha when contemporary Seminole sites lack any ceramics suggests that anti-slavery resistance is not the same as rejecting the colonial social or economic structure.
This idea, that resistance to slavery still leaves room for the acceptance of colonial society, is also apparent in the interpretation of ethnogenesis at the sites. In many cases, ethnogenesis at the three sites seems to be the result of practicality, or opportunity. Ethnic identity lives in everyday routine, things like foodways, clothing, and architecture, and the material record suggests that Maroons, slaves, and Euro-Americans were all subject to the blending effects of colonial society. Architecture reflects the adoption of a European form by Maroons and the possible adoption of an African form by Europeans, however, the complicated nature of culture “contact” means that we cannot precisely trace the cultural origins of any architectural form. Similarly, the presence of European ceramics on all three sites, and the presence of Seminole ceramics at Peliklikaha, while suggestive of some sort of cultural change, cannot be assumed to have the same significance as European ceramics on a European site or Seminole ceramics on a Seminole site. Faunal materials serve as a reminder that people adapted to local environments and economies, and personal items like buttons and beads are an indication of the unique cultural entities, such as African-American identity, that emerged from the colonial endeavor.

Discussion

In many ways, the daily lives of Maroons in Florida were very similar to those of their enslaved peers. Maroons and slaves alike were opportunistic; feeding their families, acquiring goods, and building their homes in ways as much dictated by the realities of life in frontier Florida as by any cultural precedent. However, it seems that it is in that opportunism, in the process of negotiating daily life, that ethnogenesis occurs. We can see cultural transformation in the production of cloth, the arrangement of houses, and the purchase of ceramics – simple everyday acts, that require individuals to call on their both their past and present to move forward. At every site we see need, desire, and opportunity play out, however, the specific
transformations differ at each site studied. We can read resistance in the material record and differing kinds and degrees of resistance do seem to shape the sites. In some instances, expectations are met, such as the presence of slate writing fragments at Bulow Plantation. However, in others, like the paucity of ammunition at Peliklikaha; the practice of resistance must be reconsidered. Analysis demonstrates that Cheryl White’s (2011) assertion, that Maroon archaeology cannot proceed on the basis of resistance theory alone, is accurate, and that the same can be said of the archaeology of enslaved populations.

The following discussion addresses the role of opportunity in ethnogenesis at Peliklikaha, Bulow Plantation, and 71 Park Place, and the ways that the three sites contribute to a complex understanding of resistance in the African Diaspora. It first looks at the reciprocal nature of ethnogenesis, the political, social, and cultural impact of slaves and Maroons in Florida, and highlights the ways that Maroons remained tied to colonial society. Then it considers how African success within the colonial system can be accommodated by the concept of resistance, and looks at the cases of agriculture and literacy. Next, the role of women as agents of cultural transformation is examined with a focus on the production and maintenance of clothing and the issues of visibility, privacy, and defense on the Florida frontier are addressed. Finally, we look more closely at the definition of marronage and examine the varying effects of different kinds of resistance on the material world.

**Collective Ethnogenesis**

As discussed in Chapter 2, ethnogenesis is both an internal and external process. Forged through contact and conflict, it requires multiple parties, and, as we can see through an examination of 19th century Maroon and plantation sites in Florida, ultimately influences multiple parties. We can observe the multi-directional character of ethnogenesis by looking at
architecture and space at the three sites. The log-cabin style structures at Peliklikaha reflect the adoption of a European form to fit African and Native American needs. The cabins were cool in the summer and warm in the winter, and survived well even in wet Southern winters (Breeden 1980:125; Ferguson 1992:81). The early theories of acculturation would stop here; arguing that Africans and Native Americans gradually adopted European culture, a process manifested in their material culture. However, we can also see the adoption of an African form to fit European needs in the cabin arrangement at Bulow Plantation. The arrangement of cabins at Bulow may very well have had its origins in West African village forms (Brown ad Rivers 2014:176), but that form made the surveillance of slave homes and activities easier for the plantation owner and overseer (Schafer 2003:54-56; Stowell 1996:73), and enabled better defense of the plantation (Davidson and Ibarrola 2016:130). In both cases, while knowledge of another form existed, people chose to use the one that offered them an advantage. The opportunity existed to have a more comfortable house or to manage a workforce more efficiently and that opportunity was acted on. We can see that the adoption of new construction styles or housing arrangements took place when it made sense; people negotiated the terms of culture change.

In many cases, it is impossible to determine exactly where a particular form originated, a reality that speaks to the nature of cenogenic society (Bilby 1988). The sociocultural fusions emerging on the Florida frontier were truly unprecedented and understandably complex given the number of cultural histories at play. From the incorporation of native Floridians into European and then Seminole society, the constant arrival of slaves from Africa, the rotating presence of multiple Europeans powers, the eventual southward immigration of both African-Americans and Euro-Americans already transformed by life in colonial America; Florida was host to an infinite number of unique social interactions in a particular environmental setting, resulting in new
cultural fusions. All of which make it difficult to trace the cultural lineage of something like house construction, and suggest that it is misleading to do so. We can ponder the origins of the earthfast technique used at 71 Park Place, drawing links to other places and times; however, it is also necessary to recognize that the construction may have been the result of a complex mix of cultural influences and local environmental realities, not a cultural holdover.

Recognizing the multidirectional nature of ethnogenesis also serves as a reminder that resistance and domination are two parts of a shared experience. It was not just remembered settlement patterns or porches that shaped Florida. African American resistance had a dramatic influence on Spanish colonial policy and later U.S. territorial policy. In Spanish Florida, resistance and innovation among Native Americans, nonelite Spanish, and Africans, “quickly recast the original imperial project from one of a private-monarchical mercantile partnership to [a] territorially based and centrally controlled pattern of political and economic domination” (Deagan 2003:4,9). From economic policy to labor organization, gender relations to idealized social identity; colonial society in Florida was impacted by the very fact that people contested the roles they had been cast in (Deagan 2003:9). Colonialism was not simply imposed upon the Western Hemisphere; black and indigenous actors played an active role in negotiating the process of colonization (Liebmann & Murphy 2011). Cultural interaction, whether positive or negative, requires two parties.

**Resistance and the World Economy**

Analysis of ceramics from the three sites provides some insight into the dialogue over colonization and power occurring in 19th century Florida, and confirms that Maroon or slave, Africans and African Americans were participants in colonial society. Many scholars see marronage as a break with colonial society, a denial of European power, and a practice in
African autonomy. Daniel Sayers (2014) argues that Maroons were concerned with more than freedom, and that by developing independent Maroon settlements, they demonstrated their opposition to the capitalist system as well as gaining their independence. However, comparison of the ceramic assemblage Peliklikaha with those of 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation suggests that Maroons, while no longer slaves, were still participants in colonial society. The inhabitants of Peliklikaha had more Native American wares and less European or Euro-American ceramics than did residents of either 71 Park Place or Bulow. However, the presence of numerous refined earthenwares, stoneware, and slip-trailed redware, totaling 42.8% (N=444) of the total assemblage (N=1037), contradicts the idea that Maroons somehow separated themselves from colonial society. Escaping slavery did not mean isolation from the world economy (Baram 2012; Weik 2012:113).

It seems to be more appropriate to think of marronage as simply separating the individual from the “harsh and rigid realities of life dominated by the Anglo plantation complex” (Millett 2014:41), not colonial society as a whole. Historical sources document the many connections between Maroon settlements and colonial society, from the movement of goods, to the movement of people. Even Palmares, in Brazil, one of the largest and longest occupied Maroon settlements in the Americas, self-sufficient in many ways, depended on connections with Dutch traders (Orser 1996). In 19th century Florida, Maroons raided Euro-American settlements and military convoys to obtain goods (Simmons 1973[1822]: 117,137; Porter 1996; Weik 2002:118-119; Weisman 1989:121); and engaged with traders and plantation owners alike in order to conduct cattle trades (Lewis 1969; Weik 2002:118). Although they did escape bondage, Maroons were never able to fully disentangle from their enemies (Price 1979), or from the capitalist system.
Furthermore, the failure of the Seminole nativist movement to take hold among the Maroons at Peliklikaha suggests that Maroons chose not to disentangle from the world economy. Ken Sassaman (2001:219) notes that “capitalism is hardly necessary to spawn structures of domination or its resistant consequences” and it may be that capitalism has nothing to do with Maroon resistance. While Seminole sites of the era demonstrate a certain rejection of European goods, the ceramic assemblage at Peliklikaha suggests that Maroons were open to all ceramic types. Overall, it seems that participation in the global market was limited more by location and access than culture or ideology. 71 Park Place, the only urban site, had by far the greatest number of ceramic types (N=29), and its ceramics came from the greatest number of places (eight unique points of origin). Meanwhile Bulow Plantation and Peliklikaha, had fewer ceramic types (N=11 at both sites), coming from fewer places (three points of origin are represented at Bulow, four at Peliklikaha). It may be that a degree of separation was sufficient for most Maroons, or it may be that Maroons wished to continue, and even increase, their participation in the world economy.

Comparison of ceramic assemblages also serves as a reminder that Maroon use of Seminole-style ceramics is not a reflection of their adoption of Seminole culture. European ceramics dominated North American markets in the colonial period (Weik 2002:116) and the majority of ceramics from both 71 Park Place and Bulow Plantation is European in origin. However, analysis of form, and the predominance of hollow-wares on both sites (86.1% and 80.4% of classifiable fragments, respectively), is a reminder that while the ceramics may be European the people and their food customs are not. Similarly, while the use of brushed-pottery by Maroons can be interpreted as evidence of their close alliance and trading relationship with the Seminole, ceramics are not people (Potter 1991). These bowls were interpreted through a
specific and unique cultural and social world-view and do not carry the same meaning on a Maroon site as on a Seminole site (Lightfoot et al. 1998). While they do provide some insight into daily life and in some cases may reflect economic choices and opportunities, ceramics are a poor proxy for identity.

**Resistance and Success in Colonial Society**

Both Maroons and enslaved peoples were, knowingly or not, participants in the global economy, and in many cases, contributed to the great success of capitalist ventures, including agriculture and the plantation system more specifically. Faunal materials at Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place vary significantly. Although mammals (by weight) dominate both assemblages: the similarities end there. Bulow Plantation has a wide variety of species, coming from a variety of habitats, both domestic and wild, while domestic pig dominates 71 Park Place. The acquisition of wild resources would have been a burden on enslaved peoples, however it also enabled greater selection and gave slaves some autonomy over their meals. On the other hand, animal husbandry provided slaves with a reliable source of protein with minimal input. Nonetheless, both subsistence modes are representative of African’s successful mastery of Florida resources. Although incomplete, the analysis of faunal materials from the three sites forces us to consider how Africans’ successful contributions to agriculture in Florida might be considered within the frameworks of resistance and ethnogenesis.

Africans were integral to the successful introduction of rice and indigo across the region (Brown and Rivers 2014:177; Ferguson 1992:61, 93-94) and free and enslaved blacks alike had a hand in refining Florida’s cattle industry, which utilized grazing and herding techniques developed by East and West African societies over millennia (Brown and Rivers 2014:177). Slaves were “accustomed to growing their own produce and raising their own livestock as well
as doing their own hunting, fishing, and gathering” (Millett 2013:159). However, within a system where white masters claimed ownership of everything – land, people, and products (Ferguson 1992:xxxiii) – this success, the product of cultural blending, might be considered accommodation. Although it benefitted slaves in some ways, agricultural success also contributed to the structure that oppressed them. African slaves’ introduction of cash crops, improvement of yields, and management of livestock benefitted their masters and reinforced the link between a successful capitalist system and slavery.

However, in the hands of Maroons, this same agricultural success might be considered resistance. Maroons from Peliklikaha regularly sold cattle and produce to plantation owners and traders alike, their agricultural success was widely recognized and provided more than sufficient resources for subsistence. Maroon agriculture provided the means of autonomy, and Maroons’ continued life on the frontier could be considered resistance in and of itself. Nonetheless, Maroons succeeded within a system controlled by Euro-Americans. While, unlike slaves, their success was their own, they were still participating in a greater economy that favored the spread of plantations over their freedom. How then, should African’s mastery of agriculture, animal husbandry, fishing, and hunting in Florida be considered? Is participation in a system that ultimately oppresses you automatically accommodation? Can trade be inherently resistant? How do we understand coerced action within a framework of resistance? And what does the improvement of the European colonial system by the implementation of African agricultural knowledge mean for slave resistance?

The critical role that slaves played in Florida’s agricultural success, and the use of agriculture to support Maroon communities, further reiterate the significance of opportunism in the lives of colonial Africans and African-Americans. We know that in many colonial settings,
Africans and indigenous Americans made the most of new commercial systems, and resistance is too restrictive a framework to make sense of these actions on its own. We can see that both subsistence and profit-based agriculture were sites of ethnogenesis and opportunity. The colonial Florida frontier was a new landscape for everyone involved and Africans negotiated that landscape in part through their agricultural skills.

**Literacy, Resistance, and Accommodation**

Literacy also requires a dialectical understanding of power and resistance. Teaching a slave to read and write contradicted laws designed to prevent rebellion, however, there were still a number of slaveholders, especially in Florida, who recognized the benefits of educating slaves. While on the one hand literacy made individual slaves threats to the system of slavery, on the other, an individual who could run a store or manage a business was a great asset to a slaveholder. For slaveholders, teaching a slave to read was much like arming them. Literacy, like firearms, enabled slave resistance and the slaveholder had to both believe that the law did not apply to them and trust that either loyalty or fear of retribution would keep slaves from using their new power. For slaves, literacy was a tool, but it was also part of the system that treated them as commodities. The significance of literacy for a slave is emblematic of the relational nature of power, suggesting that our interpretations of slave resistance must also encompass a discussion of accommodation.

Literacy complicates the understanding of Maroon resistance as well. Literacy was highly valued within Florida Maroon society, and was key to the success and preservation of that society. However, literacy made individuals like Abraham into traitors too. Abraham’s ability to read and write, and his multilingualism, made him a key translator and cultural broker for the Maroons and their Seminole allies. However, his role as translator and intermediary also enabled
him to make special deals with the U.S. military during the period of Indian removal protecting him and his family (Littlefield 1977:156). While Abraham’s literacy had been an asset for Maroon resistance, it eventually became a weakness. This is also true of literacy in the lives of escaped slaves more generally. While literacy gave escaped slaves and Maroons autonomy, it also made them targets for white plantation society’s fears and hostility. In the end, slave and Maroon literacy was a subversion of power, but it is worthwhile to recognize that even this highly subversive act is more complicated than it first appears.

Women as Agents of Resistance and Cultural Transformation

Archaeological evidence of clothing and personal adornment at the three sites demonstrates the close tie between culture change and resistance, as well as the critical role played by slave and free women in cultural transformation. Ethnogenesis took place on an every-day basis, the result of thousands of personal decisions, many of which were also opportunities for Africans to increase their autonomy and to assert an identity separate from that of Euro-American society. Women’s control over the production of clothing and certain items of personal adornment, like beading, suggests that they were directly responsible for one of the most visible and symbolically rich means of asserting resistance and emergent African-American identity. Furthermore, items such as the military buttons recovered from 71 Park Place and the spindle whorl from Bulow Plantation intimate that although militarized resistance is more readily apparent in the historical record, archaeology can produce a deeper insight into everyday resistance.

Throughout the Atlantic world, women of color played a crucial role in colonial society. Although these women participated in society in many of the same ways as men, both men and women had uniquely gendered experiences. Women were critical to the maintenance of stability in a period of great social change. For example, intermarriage and other consensual relationships
between European men and Native American and African women “formed a crucial dynamic in creating, transforming, and stabilizing the social milieus” of the colonial world (Deagan 2003:8). Even in situations of great power imbalance, women, through their roles as homemakers, controlled many aspects of everyday life in the colonial world. These women, at both the household and community levels, were brokers for cultural exchange.

Clothing and personal adornment were one area in which African women exerted autonomy in the colonial world. Although some colonies had laws dictating which types of cloth were appropriate for slave clothing and the wife of the plantation owner, or another female relative, often oversaw the production of clothing (White and White 1995); enslaved women were largely responsible for slaves’ wardrobes. They processed the cotton, wove the fabric, sewed the clothes, and mended and patched slaves’ wardrobes when necessary (Floyd Smith 1973:82-84; Rivers 2000:136). They also incorporated African production and stylistic elements into the production of European style clothing (Groover 1994; Picton and Mack 1979), as is suggested by the presence of a spindle whorl at Bulow Plantation.

The role of women in Maroon society is less clear, as is their involvement in the production of clothing and other goods. Within Maroon communities, women often experienced more equitable social relationships than in European society, and many Maroon women were elevated to leadership positions (Loren Katz 1986:12). Nonetheless, it is likely that Maroon women were responsible for the production of cloth and clothing, just as their enslaved peers. Although clothing related materials were recovered from Peliklikaha, the beads recovered at both Bulow Plantation and Peliklikaha are reminders of the connection between the enslaved and their free peers in the area of personal adornment. On the other hand, Maroon women would have likely had even greater agency than enslaved women over their visual expressions of identity.
They also likely influenced the Seminole’s evolving dress and personal adornment preferences. The beads recovered from Peliklikaha are potential markers for the stylistic and technical influence of African women on Seminole decorative traditions.

Although the production of clothing was a necessary task, the development of a specifically African-American visual repertoire can be interpreted as an act of resistance. Through their choices of clothing and personal adornment, Africans and Native Americans in Florida used European symbols subversively, essentially using a European language of power to convey their own power as sub-altern people. The shako tassel, military buttons, and shoe buckle recovered at 71 Park Place may be representative of this practice. In the need to cloth oneself, both Maroon and enslaved people found an opportunity to express cultural identity and self-determinism. Women were intrinsic to this practice because of their role in the production, maintenance, and repair of clothing.

Architecture, Resistance, and (In)visibility

The symbolic language of clothing and personal adornment is not the only instance in which visibility impacted the practice of resistance on the three sites. Analysis of architectural materials suggests that visibility on the landscape was a defining factor for the practice of resistance. While architectural materials and their distribution at each of the three sites reiterate the multi-directional nature of ethnogenesis and suggest that practicality and opportunity are the origins of cultural change, analysis of architecture also suggests that great variation exists between each of the three sites. The architectural features documented at Bulow Plantation and 71 Park Place, and Peliklikaha’s location on the landscape, emphasize the significance of visibility (and invisibility) to resistance and indicate that expressions of resistance were inherently different at each site. Additionally, when considered in conjunction with firearms, the site locations and layouts suggest that although a shared concern for defense existed amongst
inhabitants of the frontier region, that concern manifested differently for Maroons and plantation owners.

While it has been suggested elsewhere in this paper that Maroons should not be defined by their resistance, their separation from the plantation system and relative autonomy are not insignificant in the comparison of the three sites. Peliklikaha’s inhabitants’ continued resistance, and the specific form of that resistance, manifested in a large, open town with extensive agricultural fields and large solid buildings. Their freedom and continued military defense of that freedom enabled them to establish a large visible settlement, albeit close to a less hospitable swamp. On the other hand, the potential for resistance amongst slaves was likely a factor in the Bulow’s decision to arrange the cabins on their plantation in an arc and meant that the sub-floor pit would have been one of the only entirely private spaces on the plantation for the cabin’s enslaved residents. Visibility was a means of control and invisibility a means of resistance.

Meanwhile, at 71 Park Place, the cabin is likely the only structure on the entire plantation, which is itself on the outskirts of town, and surveillance and visibility do not seem to be a significant issue.

The relative visibility of Peliklikaha on the landscape is not insignificant. We typically assume that Maroon settlements will be located in caves and swamps, strategically hidden from view to prevent attacks and one of Price’s (1979) characteristics for Maroon settlements is a location in a remote and inhospitable environment. However, it seems that the relationship between resistance and visibility is more complex than assumed. Peliklikaha’s location was relatively remote at the time of its settlement, and it may be that the expanse of land unsettled by Europeans provided a safety buffer. The recovery of only two pieces of lead shot at Peliklikaha supports historical sources stating that the site was abandoned when General Eustis arrived,
suggests that Maroons were more highly dependent on livestock than wild resources, and most importantly, leads us to believe that guns were not a common commodity at the site. Further research at strategic Maroon hideouts, like Kettle Island on the Withlacoochee River, (Carr and Steele 1993:266; Prince 1837), may ultimately reveal that Maroons, although variously tied to the Spanish, British, and Seminoles militarily, were not all active combatants.

While Maroon concern over defense may ultimately be found to manifest in separate place of escape, like that described at Kettle Island, rather than a well-armed town, it seems that Bulow and 71 Park Place were meant to be defended, not abandoned, in times of conflict. Bulow’s arrangement, which may have been strategically arranged for surveillance, is also significant in its defensibility. The site was so well designed for military defense that troops were stationed there briefly at the start of the Second Seminole War. The Hernandez orange grove, on the other hand, while not well protected in and of itself, was located close to town and thus perhaps the safest of all of the sites. Although we might expect Peliklikaha to take the form of a hideout, with natural and man-made defenses, and many Maroon settlements across the globe do, the Maroon defense strategy at Peliklikaha differs significantly from that of the plantation owners. Despite our assumptions, visibility, or invisibility, is not a tool of resistance at Peliklikaha.

**Resistance and Maroon Identity**

Discussion of visibility ultimately raises the question of escape’s effects. Maroons are defined by their separation, their absence, but did Maroons truly escape by removing themselves from the plantation system? What were the lived effects of separation and the end of constant surveillance? History tells us that although Maroons escaped the daily cruelty of enslavement, they were not free from Euro-American hegemony and a system structured with their oppression in mind. Even after the end of slavery, racism persisted and the punishment of black bodies
remains an issue in contemporary society. However, our analysis suggests that Maroons may not have sought to reject colonial society as a whole, which can be seen in their participation in trade with Europeans and Euro-Americans and use of ceramics rejected by their Seminole allies.

Maroons, like their enslaved kin on plantations, were active participants in colonial society.

In a discussion of freedom and slavery, it is important to note that the line between the two phenomenon can be ambiguous; they are not mutually exclusive experiences. While “free Africans may have enjoyed better opportunities for cultural exchange with other Americans and unhindered development of African cultural traditions than did slaves” (Reitz 1994:23), they were still excluded from full participation in Spanish society and maintained a lower social standing despite their personal merits. Similarly, African-Americans continue to experience vast social inequality in contemporary society, including impediments to legal rights supposedly guaranteed by law. Additionally, legal status in colonial and territorial Florida was flexible and dependent upon the colonial power’s ability to enforce their will. Hundreds of Black Seminoles were returned to their previous owners over the course of the Seminole Wars, their experiences of freedom were not guaranteed or permanent.

Maroons were not always Maroons, and how we choose to study their lives and anti-slavery resistance shapes our understanding of their identity. The name “Maroon” is reflective of the shared experiences of a particular group of people, however, Maroons also shared experiences with other people who cannot claim that title. Maroons and slaves alike negotiated colonial society on a daily basis. In the study of Maroons, we should ask: “at what point does the uniqueness or distinction of the identity of a Maroon become apparent?” and, “conversely, at what point do regional and local cultural identities subsume Maroon cultural identity?” (Weik 1997:86). The identity of “Maroon” is exciting and emotionally powerful but although we attach
great significance to that title, we must also recognize that it is contextually specific, flexible, and layered. Although Maroons were in some way the antithesis of colonial society, they were also a normal part of that structure. While archaeological research at Peliklikaha, Bulow Plantation, and 71 Park Place demonstrates that resistance shaped Maroon daily life in specific ways, and that life as a Maroon was undoubtedly different than life as a slave, it also suggests that freedmen and slaves alike constantly negotiated their position within colonial society, resulting in unique cultural transformations.

**Recommendations**

Any number of recommendations can be made based on both the internal and external limitations of this thesis, and several specific improvements, such as completion of faunal analysis for all three sites, should be prioritized. However, three key changes would make the greatest positive contribution to future research: (1) drawing on a broader literature of resistance, (2) increasing the range of resources used, both historical and archaeological, and (3) expanding the comparison, both in time and scope.

As noted throughout this work, Maroon archaeology, and the archaeology of the African Diaspora in general, requires a complex understanding of resistance. Frankly, the required complexity is not something we see in contemporary Maroon archaeology, which tends to characterize Maroons as completely removed from colonial society or simply extensions of indigenous societies (Sayers 2014; Weik 2009; White 2011). However, a wealth of anthropological and historical writing exists on the coexistence of accommodation and resistance, the balance sought by all members of the colonial world. By drawing on this writing from across the Atlantic world—including that which focuses specifically on indigenous peoples and their interactions with European colonists, how they negotiated the terms of colonialism and responded when their terms were not met—we will be better able to understand the process of
resistance and the significance of the differing forms of resistance. By better understanding the continuum of resistance (Weik 1997:84), we can better understand Maroon resistance.

Additionally, building on our theory of resistance may provide some insight into how best to deal with material that is evidence of both ethnogenesis and resistance. We can see that Maroons’ “cultural and daily lives were an intimate part of their broader goal of achieving complete freedom” (Millett 2013:194) and when studying Maroons, it is difficult to “separat[e] the material culture of resistance from the syncretism of the diverse cultural influences” present in these communities (Howard 2013:39). Although this work already deals with the simultaneous occurrence of resistance and ethnogenesis, by expanding our theory of resistance we may be more readily able to deal with the presence of materials like Seminole ceramics on Maroon sites.

Particularities may also be better explained through more thorough archival and archaeological research. According to Terry Weik, Maroon archaeologists must be willing to commit to “prolonged” and “tenacious” research; “scholars studying self-liberated Africans will have to remain cognizant of the fact that they must make sacrifices to realize success, just as their research subjects did in the past” (Weik 2012:79). Additionally, while thorough archival research is important for any archaeological project, it may be doubly important for the study of ethnogenesis, “because the relationship between ethnic (or cultural) identity and its reinforcing material symbols is often intentionally hidden from outside observation, the archaeology of ethnogenesis can only proceed after a detailed study of ethnographic and documentary sources” (Weisman 2000:299). Many military and governmental records can be more thoroughly mined for data, however, alternative resources such as private journals or Seminole records may be better able to produce much needed information about women’s lives and internal social
dynamics. Meanwhile, more sophisticated testing such as palynology and ceramic compositional analysis may be able to tell us more about specific areas like diet and craft production. Of course, use of these resources and methodologies are limited by availability, time, and financial resources; however, the more information we have, the more accurate our conclusions will be.

Conversely, while more careful scrutiny of archival sources or materials testing may lend insight to future analysis, the most critical improvement that can be made is an expansion of the comparative framework. This thesis looked at just three sites from a narrow timeframe and relatively narrow geographical window. While this limited frame served to focus analysis and produced what is essentially an archaeological snapshot of the 19th century, an investigation which deals explicitly with multiple scales, from the individual household to the colonial system, and which grapples with change over time, all the way from the 16th century to the present day, would be better able to reflect the dynamism and complexity of Maroon life. By expanding analysis we can truly get at an understanding of the colonial system and Maroons interactions with that system.

The very nature of ethnogenesis suggests that the timeframe for analysis be expanded. The factors that produce cultural identities vary through time and our analysis should reflect the dynamic nature of cultural contact and exchange (Howard 2013:38). This expansion would enable us to look more closely at associations and trends that emerge over longer periods of time, using archaeological data, not simply historical narrative. It seems especially appropriate to expand the temporal frame given the volatile nature of Florida politics and the continual evolution of marronage in Florida.

On the other hand, the potential for an even more multifaceted study of resistance is a strong incentive for expanding the scope of the project. Not only should more Maroon village
sites be included as the data becomes available (as well as material from the Maroon manned forts, other plantation sites, and free-black settlements), the inclusion of Euro-American and Native American sites would make for a more complex analysis and provide greater context for the Maroon sites. Although according to Kathy Deagan, “engaging in a comparative, archaeologically informed study of colonial systems in the Americas is something that we as archaeologists rarely do” (2003:9), we should not be scared away from the undertaking.
In his 2006 book, *Constructing Floridians*, historian Daniel Murphree asserts that Florida’s development, “hinged less on the activities of single nation-states or uniform ethnic/cultural standards than on the fluid mindsets and material expectations” of the population (Murphree 2013:5). Although the focus of Murphree’s monograph is European and Native Americans groups, Florida’s Maroon and enslaved African populations seem to have acted with much of the same fluidity and adaptability. Ultimately, the narrative of the African Diaspora in Florida is one about opportunity and endurance, in which individuals acting in their best interests call on both their cultural past and present in order to make the most of a system that they did not design.

This thesis examined three archaeological sites—Peliklikaha, a Maroon town in North Central Florida; Bulow Plantation, a large rural plantation on Florida’s northeast coast; and 71 Park Place, a small urban plantation in St. Augustine; all of which date from the late Second Spanish period and early Territorial Period—with the purpose of building a more complex comparison of Maroons and enslaved peoples than is typically presented in the literature. It is necessary to build this comparison because scholars often define Maroons by their marronage, effectively isolating them from every other subaltern group in the colonial world, and because, within Florida history, Maroons are often cast in supporting roles despite their considerable and direct impact on Florida’s colonial economy, society, and political course. In order to develop the comparison, analysis looked specifically at resistance and ethnogenesis, purposefully adopting frameworks that would enable a closer, more complex look at both power relations and ethnicity. For many, Maroons are representative of the colonial world, the destructive yet productive clash of people and ideas that Columbus initiated in 1492. However, again, Maroons
were not the only group of people negotiating colonial society and were far from the only group practicing anti-slavery resistance. The primary objective of this thesis was to better understand how Maroons built their ethnic identity and performed resistance by placing them within the broader context of the African Diaspora. Through analysis of architectural materials, ceramics, faunal remains, and personal items, we can conclude that people of the African Diaspora, regardless of their legal status, held a great deal in common, the most apparent being their fluidity. Analysis suggests that ethnogenesis resulted from the taking of opportunity, from military alliances to cabin construction. However, the groups also vary significantly given their differing needs and opportunities. Maroon resistance did in fact shape Maroon society and culture in a specific way, and the same can be said for each of the enslaved populations.

As noted earlier, Maroon archaeology in Florida began, almost accidentally, nearly 70 years ago, with John Griffin’s (1950) survey of Prospect Bluff on the Apalachicola River. After seven decades, relatively little research has been done on Maroon sites in the region, however, more recently, archaeologists, led by Uzi Baram and the “Finding Angola Project,” have reinvigorated the investigation of Maroon life in Florida and sought to expand how we do Maroon archaeology. This refocusing is significant because the archaeology of Maroons is well poised to address many issues of significance within the broader field of Africa Diaspora archaeology. The study of Maroons can contribute to the move away from the stagnant study of cultural holdovers and towards the increasingly significant study of creolization and ethnogenesis. Maroon archaeology can also move the field towards a better understanding of the historical formation of African American identity, particularly in relation to the intersection of race and ethnicity.
Maroon archaeology in Florida is also significant because of its potential impact on popular history. Although the ultimate goal of archaeological research should not simply be historical supplementation (Weik 1997), Maroon archaeology does bring to light a relatively unknown story in Florida’s history and is significant to the public interpretation of black life in the region. Historian Joseph Opala writes about the significance of the Seminole Maroon alliance; “politically, Florida was in the hands of its new inhabitants… it was colored Spanish on the map… largely for the amusement of white men” (as quoted in Loren Katz 1986:50), however, modern consciousness of marronage in Florida is extremely limited. In 2003, journalist turned historian Vickie Oldham found that Tampa’s general public was under the impression that African Americans had not settled in that area until the late 19th century, despite the recorded presence of a mid-century Maroon settlement on the southeast side of the bay (Howard 2013:33). Maroon archaeology, even if it does nothing more, has the capacity to bring an unfamiliar story to the public.

Furthermore, Maroons tell a story of subaltern resistance, identity, and agency in an era typically defined by white male politicians and military figures. According to historian Jane Landers, recent historical and archaeological works on the colonial Spanish era suggest that “African Americans exercised more important and varied roles… than has previously been appreciated. These studies make it clear than no history of Florida, or the Southeast, is complete without considering this complex and multidimensional African experience” (Landers 1996:181). While most writers have considered Maroons as Spanish or Seminole allies (Twyman 1999:2), by looking more closely at their role as independent actors we can expand the narrative of African-American life in Florida and emphasize the significance of black contributions to Florida’s development over time. The Maroon story is more than historical
supplementation; it is an important key to appreciating the complexity of African life in the Americas and understanding the emergence of African American ethnicity.

Significantly, the Maroon experience cannot be understood by looking at ethnicity or resistance alone. However, together, these frameworks have the capacity to tell us something about Maroon identity and the place of Maroons in both the African Diaspora and colonial society as a whole. Analysis of material culture recovered at the three sites suggested that Maroons were no different than their enslaved peers. Their resistance shaped the material record in a particular way, but it also shaped the record in a particular way at the plantation sites, and was likely just one of many factors influencing daily life. By focusing on the emergence of identity, rather than identity as defined by resistance, we can see that Maroons and slaves alike were adaptable in many ways, and that this adaptability, this process of negotiating daily life, was key to their endurance.
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