

WINDOWS INTO THE PAST

ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSESSMENT OF THREE
CITY POINT LOTS, CITY
OF HOPEWELL, VIRGINIA



PREPARED FOR:
The City of Hopewell

PREPARED BY:
William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research

Rail Road
Wharf

WINDOWS INTO THE PAST

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF THREE CITY POINT LOTS, CITY OF HOPEWELL, VIRGINIA

WMCAR Project No. 02-23

PREPARED FOR:

The City of Hopewell
300 North Main Street
Hopewell, Virginia 23860
(804) 541-2270

PREPARED BY:

William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research
The College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia 23187-8795
(757) 221-2580

AUTHORS:

David W. Lewes
John R. Underwood
Todd L. Jensen
Dennis B. Blanton

WITH A CONTRIBUTION BY:

Susan Trevarthen Andrews

PROJECT DIRECTOR:

Dennis B. Blanton

MAY 20, 2003

ABSTRACT

From July through October 2002, the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research investigated three properties within the City Point section of the City of Hopewell. This research was performed at the request of Hopewell's city government to partly fulfill long-term goals of improving historical interpretation and enhancing the city's planning abilities.

A 0.5-acre study area along Prince Henry Avenue was subjected to systematic shovel test survey, evaluation through seven hand-excavated test units and two machine trenches, and data recovery excavation of selected features. Evidence of activity in the study area ranged from the earliest prehistoric periods through the present. The primary prehistoric occupations date to the Late Archaic (3000–1000 BC) and Late Woodland/protohistoric (AD 900–1600) periods. An abundance of nineteenth-century artifacts was found, but the Civil War occupation yielded the most significant results. A cellar/trash pit that was filled at the end of the war included military artifacts and large quantities of animal bone from food refuse. These faunal remains were analyzed by a zooarchaeologist and the results are reported in an appendix.

Intensive excavations on the significant resources at the Prince Avenue property limited the work at the two other study areas to survey-level investigations. Systematic shovel testing of a 2.3-acre study area at the intersection of Pierce and Spruance streets also revealed numerous occupations spanning the prehistoric and historic eras. The primary prehistoric occupation dates to the Late Woodland period. Historic-period evidence includes the remains a possible nineteenth-/twentieth-century African-American church and the foundation of an early twentieth-century structure that became the first Patrick Copeland School.

A 3.3-acre municipal park that contains a Civil War earthwork was also subjected to systematic shovel testing. Principal occupations include Archaic-stage activity areas, a light scatter of Woodland-stage ceramics, and remains of a Union army camp associated with the earthwork.

Suggestions for more focused historical interpretation at City Point and Hopewell are also presented in an appendix. These recommendations are based on a limited review of archival resources, consideration of existing interpretive venues in Hopewell and the surrounding region, and the results of the current archaeological investigations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research is thankful for this exciting opportunity. We commend Hopewell's city council for their vision to protect and interpret City Point's matchless heritage. Councilor Steve Taylor deserves much of the credit for spearheading the initiative and bringing it to fruition. His enthusiasm for the project has been inspiring to us all. We are also grateful for his willingness to help coordinate logistics and for some important tips on local history sources. We also would like to especially thank councilors Taylor, Paul Karnes, and Vanessa Justice for serving on the council's archaeology oversight committee. Herbert Bragg, of the City's Public Information/Research Office, also deserves our gratitude for quickly finding answers to many questions about the city, both past and present. Encouragement has also come from a core of local history enthusiasts, in particular Jim Micklem and Mary Calos of the Historical Hopewell Foundation. Mary kindly gave us a special tour of the foundation's properties during their off-season. We are gratified that so many local residents showed interest in the project. Some made regular site visits to follow our progress, while others responded positively to our project website. After all, one of the most important objectives of public archaeology is to engage the citizens who support our work.

Before crediting our current staff, we would like to thank a former colleague. While co-director of the Center, Donald Linebaugh earned a well-deserved reputation for archaeology in Hopewell with his excavations on the Kippax Plantation Site. Now a professor at the University of Kentucky, Don declined Hopewell's invitation to do the current project but kindly recommended the Center in his place. The Center's current director, Dennis Blanton, oversaw all aspects of the project and shaped the research goals. Todd Jensen and John Underwood led the daily field operations and reported on those results. The archaeological field crew included Kelly Arford, Jack Aube, Courtney Birkett, Evan Leavitt, Feliza Madrigal, Kristie Martin, Chrissie Schlegel, Troy Valos, Mike Webb, and Danielle Wheeler. In the laboratory, Debbie Davenport was responsible for processing artifacts, analysis of historic-period material, and preparing the artifact inventory; Dennis Blanton analyzed all prehistoric artifacts. David Lewes conducted archival research, wrote sections of the report, and drafted preliminary suggestions for public interpretation at City Point. With Dennis Blanton, he also designed and maintained the project website. Eric Agin applied his expertise with GIS to create the interpretive overlays of historic maps and prepared most of the final illustrations for the report. Finally, Susan Trevarthan Andrews of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation analyzed the faunal remains from Feature 8 and contributed a thoughtful discussion of her findings.

CONTENTS

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Contents</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Figures</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Tables</i>	<i>vi</i>
1: Introduction	1
2: Cultural Contexts	9
3: Prince Henry Avenue Lot	35
4: Pierce Street Lots	69
5: Fort Park	81
6: Conclusions and Future Directions	93
References Cited	99
Appendix A: Artifact Inventory	
Appendix B: Faunal Analysis	
Appendix C: Interpretive Planning Recommendations	

FIGURES

1	Location of City Point and the three study areas	2
2	Hallmarks of prehistoric periods in Virginia	10
3	Portion of Captain John Smith’s (1612) map of Virginia showing native settlements near City Point	12
4	Portion of Vingboons’ (1639 [1617]) chart of the James River showing the location of “Bermotho Citie” at City Point	15
5	Sketch of first train leaving City Point in 1838	19
6	Portion of “A map and profile of the City Point Railroad,” 1837	20
7	Current street plan of City Point overlaid with features from Couty’s (1837) map	21
8	Map of City Point, 1844	22
9	Plat of Eppes plantation, 1856	23
10	Dr. Richard Eppes’ landholdings in 1860	24
11	Painting of military activity along the James River waterfront, 1864	25
12	Military locomotive at the City Point depot, 1865	25
13	Docks at City Point, James River, Va., July 5, 1864	26
14	The James River at City Point, ca. 1864–1865	26
15	Map of Union army infrastructure at City Point, 1865	27
16	Current street plan of City Point overlaid with features from Quartermaster General’s Office (1865) map	28
17	“Map of Bermuda Hundred” showing Union defenses around City Point	29
18	Wharves at City Point after the explosion of ordnance barges on August 9, 1864	29
19	Decayed wharves along the James River waterfront in the late nineteenth century	30
20	Plat of Du Pont era neighborhoods, 1918	31
21	Prince Henry Avenue lot, site plan	36
22	Prince Henry Avenue lot, view north toward Bank Street	37
23	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Shovel Test 13, profile	38
24	Typical shovel test	38
25	Prince Henry Avenue lot, distribution of prehistoric artifacts from shovel tests	39
26	Prince Henry Avenue lot, distribution of Colonial–Federal period artifacts from shovel tests	40
27	Prince Henry Avenue lot, distribution of Antebellum–Reconstruction period artifacts from shovel tests	41
28	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 1, west profile	43
29	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 1, Features 1 and 2, plan	43
30	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 2, west profile	44
31	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 3, west and east profiles	44
32	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 3, Feature 5, plan	45
33	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 4, north profile	46
34	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 4, Features 3 and 4, plan	46
35	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 5, north profile	48
36	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 5, Features 6 and 7, plan	48
37	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 6, profile	49

38	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 6, Features 12 and 13, plan	49
39	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 7, Feature 14, plan	50
40	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Trenches 1 and 2, plan of exposed features	51
41	Prince Henry Avenue lot, backhoe removing topsoil/plowzone from trench	53
42	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 9, plan and profile	54
43	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 18, plan and profile	54
44	Prince Henry Avenue lot, plan of Feature 8 and nearby features at west end of Trench 2	56
45	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, surface, plan view	56
46	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, north profile shape, four cross sections, and east profile	57
47	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, east profile view	58
48	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, top of Lower Fill, west half	58
49	Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, top of Stratum III (Lower Fill), east half	59
50	Prince Henry Avenue, tobacco pipe bowls	64
51	Prince Henry Avenue, military artifacts	66
52	Prince Henry Avenue, buttons	66
53	Prince Henry Avenue, personal artifacts	67
54	Pierce Street lot, plan showing shovel test locations and surface features	70
55	Pierce Street lot, Shovel Tests 7, 11, 12, and 49, profiles	71
56	Pierce Street lot, distribution of prehistoric and historic artifacts	74
57	Pierce Street lot, distribution of prehistoric lithic and ceramic artifacts	75
58	Pierce Street lot, distribution of Colonial–Federal period, Antebellum–Reconstruction period, and Modern period artifacts	77
59	Pierce Street, prehistoric artifacts and historic-period tobacco pipestem	78
60	Fort Park, plan showing shovel test locations and surface features	82
61	Fort Park, view to the west with earthworks in background	83
62	Fort Park, Shovel Tests 17, 48, and 85, profiles	83
63	Fort Park, distribution of prehistoric and historic artifacts	85
64	Fort Park, distribution of prehistoric lithic artifacts and exotic lithic materials	87
65	Fort Park, distribution of prehistoric tools and fire-cracked rock	88
66	Fort Park, distribution of historic artifacts predating 1900	90
67	Fort Park, hafted bifaces and bifaces	91
69	Union troops in front of sutler’s tent at Bealeton, Virginia	96

TABLES

1	Prince Henry Avenue, summary of identified features	52
2	Prince Henry Avenue, summary of historic artifacts from Feature 8 by level and function	60
3	Prince Henry Avenue, comparison of prehistoric artifact classes by context	61
4	Prince Henry Avenue, comparison of diagnostic historic artifacts by period and context	63
5	Comparison of classes of prehistoric artifacts from shovel tests by study area	94
6	Comparison of diagnostic historic artifacts recovered from shovel tests by period and study area	95

1: Introduction

City Point has attracted human settlement for thousands of years. Boasting a deep-water port, the small peninsula between the Appomattox and James rivers was ideally situated for maritime and rail connections between larger cities to the west and the Chesapeake Bay and Atlantic Ocean. Surprisingly though, much of this community's history remains something of an enigma. Apart from the late Civil War, when General Grant chose City Point for his headquarters and a supply base for the decisive campaign against Petersburg, much of the colonial and even post-Civil War history is unclear or the subject of speculation. City Point's prehistory too is a field ripe for further research. Our knowledge of pre-colonial native peoples depends on archaeology that has at most skirted the perimeter of the City Point peninsula. In this light, therefore, the following report begins to mend these gaps in the understanding of City Point's past.

Aware that City Point ranked as a unique historical and archaeological site, members of the City of Hopewell's city council determined to improve public interpretation through archaeological research. In August 2002, the council selected the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research to begin a preliminary investigation of selected lots that the city owned or planned to purchase. A lot at the corner of Prince Henry Avenue and Pelham Street would be examined first; depending on the findings, the project could focus more intensively on that lot and/or extend to other areas of high potential owned by the city. Eventually, two other properties (a park on East Broadway and lots at the corner of Pierce and Spruance streets) underwent archaeological survey. In addition, the research at Prince Henry Avenue was expanded to include test unit excavation, machine-excavated

trenches, and excavation of an important subsurface feature dating to the Civil War.

The results of these investigations, conducted during the late summer and fall of 2002, show that City Point is indeed fruitful ground for archaeological research. All three study areas encompassed potentially significant archaeological deposits, ranging from the Late Archaic and Woodland periods of prehistory to the Civil War era and even the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Descriptions and interpretations of these findings follow, along with recommendations for future archaeological research at City Point, and a complete inventory of artifacts recovered. Appendix B presents a detailed analysis of the animal bone recovered from a large Civil War pit feature. Toward the city's long-term goal of improving historical interpretation, Appendix C suggests historical themes that would best engage the public. These suggestions draw both from archaeological results as well as a limited review of primary and secondary historical sources.

LOCATION AND SETTING

Three study areas were investigated in the City of Hopewell. All are within the historic City Point section of town (Figure 1). Investigations began at 500 Prince Henry Avenue, a vacant lot of approximately 0.5 acres extending between Pelham Street on the southeast and Bank Street on the northwest. Across the ravine to the south, a second study area was investigated on the south side of Pierce Street. The area consisted of three vacant lots totaling 2.3 acres located on the southwest and southeast corners of the intersection of Pierce with Spruance Street. The third study area is a 3.3-acre municipal park containing well-preserved earthen fortifications built by



Figure 1. Location of City Point and study areas (U.S. Geological Survey 1994).

the Union army during the Civil War. Located about 600 m southwest of the Pierce Street study area, the park is bounded by Fort Street to the northeast, Wilson Street to the southwest, East Broadway Street to the southeast, and Appomattox Street to the northwest.

While the City of Hopewell is a relatively new town (established in 1916), it encompasses the much older community of City Point (annexed in 1923). City Point was formally established in 1826, but a small hamlet and port have existed there since colonial times. Since 1979, the historic core of City Point has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. While the official historic district extends less than 600 m south of the tip of the peninsula (see Figure 1), the City Point neighborhood includes streets a few hundred meters further to the south and southwest.

Until the early twentieth century (except for intensive military use during the Civil War), only the low terrace along the James River waterfront and the bluffs above were even sparsely developed. Beyond this village, the area now called City Point fell within a vast estate owned since the seventeenth century by the Eppes family. Their Appomattox Manor plantation house near the bluff edge commanded a view of both rivers and dominated a landscape of open fields with scattered agricultural buildings and slave quarters. In the early twentieth century, the agricultural landscape gave way to medium-density residential neighborhoods. A core of the old plantation grounds remains around Appomattox Manor, now managed by the National Park Service as a part of the Petersburg National Battlefield. Just southeast of the old port area along the James (now a park), the edges of Hopewell's industrial district extend up to the City Point waterfront.

City Point is at the western edge of the Coastal Plain physiographic province in the fall line transition zone. A rich variety of wildlife and vegetation characterize this zone (Egloff 1989:71–72). Combined with easy access to both the Coastal Plain and the Piedmont region, the area offers an abundance of wild food resources and fertile soils for farming. West of the fall line, straddled by Petersburg and Richmond, the great estuarine rivers are rocky,

fast-flowing, and unsuitable for navigation. In the transition zone at City Point, these rivers are subject to tides and remain slightly brackish. The Coastal Plain is characterized by a layer of sediments that progressively thickens toward the coastline, overlying Precambrian and Mesozoic rock (Roberts and Bailey 2003). This region has a humid, temperate climate and ample annual rainfall for the cultivation of most crops (Jones et al. 1985:35).

The topography of City Point is dramatically defined by high bluffs overlooking the Appomattox and James rivers on the west and northeast. Along the James River, a low terrace below the bluffs is wide enough for waterfront development, while the base of the bluffs along the Appomattox sits only a few meters back from the river bank. Moving back from the bluffs, the gently sloping ground is dissected by occasional steep ravines with spring-fed draws feeding into the rivers.

As expected given City Point's long history as a plantation, most of the soils are suitable for cultivation and pasture. Newflat silt loam, Pamunkey loam, and Wickham fine sandy loam, are all deep, well-drained soils with gentle slopes. These more fertile soils mainly characterize the less densely developed neighborhoods of the historic district, the vicinity of Appomattox Manor, and areas near the bluffs overlooking the Appomattox River. Emporia soils, found along the wooded river banks and ravines, are rarely suitable for farming. Besides being located on steep slopes of 15–45% that are vulnerable to erosion, these soils are low in organic content and strongly acid. The remaining soils at City Point are classified as Urban land or Urban land-Udorthents complex. Rather than defining soil types, these terms refer to the absence of classifiable soils. Most of the land surface in these areas has been covered by impervious materials such as asphalt, concrete, or buildings. These classifications apply to the more densely built neighborhoods south of the historic district and the industrial areas along the lower part of the James River waterfront (Jones et al. 1985).

RESEARCH DESIGN

General objectives of the current project included enhancing interpretation of City Point's history and

helping the City of Hopewell plan for future development. The research design focused on expediently identifying archaeological resources that could yield important new information and at the same time stimulate public and academic interest for the city's more long-term interpretive goals.

The research design was also refined by period and site type. Although human activity and settlement at City Point has been virtually continuous for the last 4,000 years, not all periods would receive the same degree of attention for this project. Some lesser known aspects of City Point's past were high on the city government's list of interests because of gaps in knowledge and relative neglect in the local area's historical interpretation over the years. In chronological order, these included English settlement in the early seventeenth century; use of the James River waterfront as a port, especially for importing slaves, during the eighteenth century; and African-American sites in general ranging from colonial and antebellum slave quarters to early twentieth-century domestic sites.

Much speculation has been voiced in regional histories about City Point's place among the earliest settlements occupied by the English in the James River basin. Despite the interest, early documents offer few details about "Bermuda Cittie," an early seventeenth-century community that was located at or very near City Point. Furthermore, little archaeological research has been done within City Point that could provide further information (Blades 1988; Stuck et al. 1997). Finding evidence of such early occupations could complement recent research at other early English sites such as Jamestown (Kelso et al. 1997) and Flowerdew Hundred (Deetz 1993). Evidence of an important shipping center at City Point is similarly unclear. Shipping news and advertisements in the mid- to late eighteenth-century *Virginia Gazette* suggest the importance of this natural harbor. Yet descriptions of the village and maps showing its extent do not appear until the nineteenth century. Archaeological research could answer many questions about the nature of the early port. Likewise, the African-American presence at City Point has not been researched or reported extensively. A new focus on African-American heritage is understandable. After all, African-Americans

made up the majority of surrounding Prince George County's population during much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Whether slaves on the Eppes plantation, laborers at the port, or freedmen residing in the Union army's installation, African-Americans have always played a pivotal role in local history. However, most historical and archaeological research has focused on the Eppes family and Appomattox Manor or the Union occupation during the Civil War. A combination of historical and archaeological research can begin to answer questions about these lesser known topics.

METHODS

The following sections summarize the methods used to carry out research for the City Point archaeological project. While the general field methods are outlined here, information about the methods specific to each study area can be found with the results of excavation in the chapters that follow. The Laboratory Methods section explains processing methods, criteria for identifying and classifying artifacts, and various analyses used to understand the sites they came from.

General Field Methods

For this first round of archaeological investigations at City Point, the goal was to advance as far as possible the city's goals of enhanced historical interpretation and improved planning. Above all, efficient discovery of the areas of high archaeological potential guided the field strategy. The first step in this process involved selection of study areas. Prior to any digging, the archaeologists scouted several city-owned lots to determine the most promising. Several factors entered into the selection process. Visible signs of prior disturbance to the ground was key. An abundance of artifacts from a site type or period of great interest would do little to enhance a lot's potential if it appeared that bulldozing or deep plowing had already jumbled the archaeological deposits. Therefore, lots with little evidence of disturbance received priority in the selection process. Another important determination of a lot's potential was its setting. Drawing on decades of prior research as well

as firsthand experience in the field, archaeologists can reliably associate landscapes with types of prior human settlement. Over time and among different cultures, factors such as proximity to fresh water and other resources, topography, presence of roads and navigable rivers, and soil types have determined where people lived, camped, or carried out specialized activities.

One of the keys to successful archaeology is knowing exactly where everything was found on a site. To make this process efficient, a *grid* was established at each study area for mapping archaeological features, excavation areas, contour elevations, and landmarks within the site. A grid also served to align regular patterns of shovel tests so that the study area could be sampled systematically. Two iron bars were driven into the ground at each study area to serve as permanent reference points for the grids.

It was also important to consistently record the depths of soil layers, artifacts, and features. That information enhances our understanding of relationships between different parts of the site. Each study area included a “datum” marker that was used as a reference for all other depths. An arbitrary site elevation of 100 m was established at each datum.

Once the grid was established, a multilayered approach of site exploration and excavation began. The first step involved *shovel testing*. Small, initial pits are a common and effective way to assess what a study area has to offer and how best to proceed with larger-scale excavations. Another well-known method of site exploration, collecting artifacts from the ground surface, would not have suited this project because lawns or other vegetation covered all three study areas. A typical shovel test is about the diameter of a dinner plate and generally no more than knee-deep. Shovel tests were dug in a regular grid of 10-m intervals at each lot. All soil from the test was sifted through quarter-inch wire mesh to recover artifacts. The kinds of artifacts in each test were recorded, along with a description of the stratigraphy (layers of soil) exposed in the pit wall. Soils were described using texture terminology standardized by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and a series of Munsell soil color charts (Munsell Corporation 1975). Information about the contents of each shovel test was entered into a computer map-

ping program (Surfer 7.0) that pinpoints areas with high concentrations of artifacts. “Hot spots” are shown with closely spaced contour lines, similar to the way a topographic map shows steep slopes. After systematically shovel testing each study area and reviewing the artifact distribution maps, decisions were made about which areas should be tested more intensively.

Test unit excavation was the next step in the process. Where shovel tests showed high concentrations of artifacts of a particular type or period of priority in the research design, the archaeologists opened larger square excavations (1 to 2 meters on a side). With more room to maneuver, the soil could be carefully peeled away, keeping artifacts from different layers separate. In these larger units, contrasting patterns of soil were apparent, indicating “features” or manmade disturbances such as pits, postholes, trenches, even traces of a plow cutting into the subsoil. These excavations provided a larger, representative sample of artifacts from different locations on the lot and allowed a better view of the soil deposits. Test units were excavated according to natural stratigraphy using flat shovels. All soil was screened through quarter-inch wire mesh to ensure uniform recovery of artifacts. Each layer, or stratum, was treated as a separate entity. Accordingly, artifacts were bagged and cataloged separately. Records of each excavated level and feature were collected on standardized forms supplemented by scale drawings and photographs.

Using information gathered from shovel tests and test units, areas were selected for *mechanical strip-ping*. A small backhoe fitted with a 60-cm-wide, smooth bucket excavated trenches in the areas, removing the disturbed topsoil to reveal archaeological features contrasting with the subsoil below. Heavy equipment is very helpful if used properly. Initial tests indicated where it was reasonable to use the machine and how much soil to remove. The greatest advantage offered by this approach is efficiency. In a given amount of time, an earth-moving machine like a backhoe can move much more soil than several people can with shovels. However, the efficiency of heavy machinery can also be a hazard. To avoid damage to the undisturbed deposits below the plowzone, archaeologists carefully monitored the

backhoe's progress. Once most of the plowzone had been removed, backhoe excavation gave way to hand "schnitting." Archaeologists used flat shovels to scrape away the remnants of plowzone in the trench to get a clearer view of any features that might be visible against the subsoil. None of the soil removed by the backhoe was screened. This plowzone deposit was already known to be disturbed; therefore, systematic recovery of artifacts would not add any important information. Diagnostic artifacts observed in the spoil were recovered, however, for the information they might provide about the general nature of the site. Once the schnitting was completed, a record was made of the trench excavation along with accompanying plan and profile drawings and photographs. Due to the limited scope of the project, trenches were excavated only at the Prince Henry Avenue lot.

Following the machine stripping, selected *features* underwent complete or partial excavation. In either case, a feature was bisected so that part of the fill was removed, revealing a profile view of the deposits within the feature. Excavation proceeded by hand using flat shovels or trowels. Soil was screened through quarter-inch mesh and artifacts were bagged and cataloged according to strata identified within the feature. Feature information was recorded on standardized forms and supplemented with scaled drawings and photographs. Two-liter soil samples were bagged from each stratum of Feature 8 at the Prince Henry Avenue study area. This soil underwent flotation in an attempt to recover botanical remains.

LABORATORY ANALYSIS

All artifacts recovered were returned to the WMCAR laboratory for washing, identification, numbering, and cataloging. Following analysis, an inventory was created using standard descriptive typology. All artifacts were prepared for curation according to standards outlined in 36 CFR Part 79 "Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections." All artifacts were then logically ordered in acid-free Hollinger boxes for temporary storage at WMCAR.

The WMCAR has developed a hierarchical, codified scheme for artifact description across multiple dimensions. All descriptive information was codified for entry into a project database using Access relational software. Using this file, overall project inventories as well as particularistic data reports can be readily generated for inclusion in reports or routine analysis. Appendix A is a complete inventory of artifacts recovered during these investigations.

Prehistoric Artifact Analysis

Prehistoric artifact analysis was designed to document basic temporal and techno-functional parameters of the assemblages. For the lithic materials, the goals were to refine our understanding of the reduction process(es) represented and the temporal and functional nature of the technologies represented. Aside from concentrations of oyster shell, no perishable organic remains were recovered from prehistoric contexts. Beyond the categories described below, all lithic debitage and tools were further identified according to raw material type.

Debitage. Primary/Reduction Flakes are placed in this category largely by default; in other words, they are identifiable as flakes but do not qualify as secondary/thinning flakes, tertiary/retouch, or bipolar flakes. General identifying characteristics, however, are relatively obtuse platforms without lipping, a pronounced bulb of percussion, and a relatively thick cross-section. Flakes in this category are interpreted as the byproducts of early stage reduction, owing largely to their tendency to exhibit simple platforms and pronounced features such as ripples and bulbs of percussion.

Secondary/Thinning Flakes are identified most readily by their cute, lipped, and generally multifaceted platforms. Such platforms are segments of biface margins removed on impact. Biface thinning flakes are also relatively thin and flat or slightly curved in cross-section. The bulb of percussion is diffuse. Two forms of this flake commonly occur. One is the better-known, lipped flake with a multifaceted platform. The other resembles a fish scale in plan view; while often lipped, lipping is very slight, and the platforms typically are narrow and curvate or recurvate. These flakes are generally con-

sidered to result from thinning and resharpening relatively refined mid-to-late stage bifaces.

Tertiary/Retouch Flakes are characterized by small, point platforms which usually are lipped, an outline which expands from the platform toward the termination, a thin cross-section, and small size (generally not more than 5 mm in the longest dimension). Tertiary/retouch flakes are recognized as the byproduct of tool retouch or resharpening.

Bipolar Flakes are distinctive but care must be taken to avoid classifying them as shatter or angular fragments, particularly if they are quartz. They have virtually no bulb of percussion and are often long and narrow, or wedge-shaped. Another distinctive feature is distinct radial lines below the points of force, any many times they exhibit crushing at opposing ends.

Flake Fragments/Shatter, as the name implies, are angular/blocky chunks of stone that are probably the byproduct of stonework but that cannot be identified as flakes or portions of flakes. These fragments are not to be confused with fire-cracked rock. They are often when blocks or nuclei of poor quality or internally flawed material are struck.

Blade-like Flakes are at least twice as long as they are wide and have long, parallel ridges or arrises on their dorsal surfaces, perpendicular to the platform. Assigning debitage to this category should be done conservatively with the intention of identifying purposefully struck, linear flakes. Some evidence of platform preparation/grinding is a valuable indicator of this.

Prismatic Blades are highly standardized blade flakes with prepared platforms, prismatic cross-sections, and a high degree of uniformity in form.

Tested Cobble/Nodules are pieces of raw material that are unmodified beyond the removal of only one or a very few flakes. Presumably they represent pieces that were tested for quality and discarded.

Tools. Utilized Flakes are flakes or flake fragments (shatter) that were utilized “as is” for cutting, scraping, etc. As such, they exhibit no intentional modification for hafting or sharpening. Instead, there will be incidental damage to the edges resulting from use, which will appear as very fine flake scars. These scars are invasive not more than 2 mm from the tool margin. Damage from screening, trampling,

etc., can mimic such use damage. To be conservative, all artifacts placed in this category must have regularized rather than intermittent or spotty damage to the edge.

Utilized flakes are subdivided according to the form of the utilized edge. Potential forms are straight, concave, convex, or denticulate. In some instances more than one of the utilized edge forms may be present.

Retouched Flakes differ from utilized flakes only in that they were intentionally modified prior to use. Flake scars on their edges are regularized but will be invasive at *least* 2 mm from the tool margin. The same subcategories of edge form apply as well.

Other Bifaces are generally regarded as preforms or generalized bifacial tools (i.e. knives). They lack modification for hafting. Following Callahan (1979), bifaces can be classified according to stage in the reduction process. Only the first four stages of his five-part scheme are recognized in the analysis.

Hafted Bifaces are formal tools more commonly known as projective points/knives. They are bifacial fragments and are modified for hafting. Diagnostic or potentially diagnostic (complete or proximal fragments) examples are coded separately from nondiagnostic pieces such as tips, ears, etc.

Other Formal Tools are formed tools other than hafted bifaces or other bifaces. Items in this category include drills and endscrapers. In most cases they exhibit modification for hafting.

Cores are the parent pieces from which potentially usable flakes are struck. Consequently, they are the best recognized by the flake scars left by prior flake removals. Cores are classified here by the nature of the flake scar patterns evident on their surfaces. Random cores exhibit random flake removals. Lamellar core are marked by regular, linear flake removals leaving parallel or subparallel flake scars. Bipolar cores are usually rather small and exhibit battering at opposing ends. One of the opposing edges is often a narrow, bifacial “crest” while the other is truncated and battered in appearance. Bifacial cores resemble thick, irregular bifaces (see Stage 2 of Callahan 1979). Tabular cores are those derived from plate-like cobbles or nodules. Flake re-

movals are directed from the margins of the piece, which readily serve as platforms.

Other Lithic Artifacts. Formal Ground stone items were modified by pecking and/or grinding rather than flaking. The degree of modification is extensive and to the point that the original form of the stone from which it was fashioned is obliterated. Typical artifacts include axes, celts, gorgets, steatite bowl fragments, etc.

Informal Ground stone includes artifacts which have been modified by pecking and/or grinding but have not been formally shaped' they retain in large part the form of the piece from which they were made such as a cobble or slab. These artifacts include hammerstones, simple grinding slabs and manos, and artifacts which are only possibly modified by grinding/pecking.

Fire-cracked Rock is recognized as rough, blocky pieces of stone which have irregular fracture surfaces. In some cases the stones may also be reddened from exposure to intense heat. This material is counted and weighed and all but a representative sample will be discarded.

Other/Unmodified Stone represents miscellaneous rock recovered incidental to collection. It bears no evidence of modification. Such material can also be referred to as "manuports." Other stone is counted and weighed and all but a representative sample will be discarded.

Prehistoric Ceramic Artifact Analysis. Prehistoric ceramic artifacts will initially be classified primarily by description along two dimensions: temper and surface treatment. Whether the artifact was a vessel or other artifact fragment will also be noted and in the case of vessel fragments the specific portion was identified. At the initial level of analysis ceramic sherds will not be "typed" in the traditional sense but grouped to temper/surface treatment. Subsequently their correlation with diagnostic types of the region will be discussed. Key references to be consulted during the analysis are Egloff and Potter's (1982) overview of Coastal Plain ceramics, a similar treatment by Mouer et al. (1986) for Central Virginia, McLearn and Mouer's (1989) discussion of lower James Rive ceramics, and descriptions in McLearn's (1987) report on riverine sites in Henrico County, Virginia.

Historic Artifact Analysis

The hierarchical historic artifact coding scheme includes both functional and temporal dimensions. At the most general level material is classified according to Group, which would include the Food Preparation/Consumption, Architectural, Furniture, Arms and Military, Clothing, Personal, Medicinal/Hygiene, Domestic Activities, Activities, Smoking, Industrial/Commercial, and Unassigned categories. Subsumed within the Groups are artifact Classes, including, for example, Ceramic Cooking/Storage, Ceramic Tableware, Glass Tableware, Window Glass, Nails, Firearm, Apparel, and Writing categories. The next level consists of objects which describe specific artifact forms such as Flatware, Jug, Jar, Bowl, Nail, Knob, Musket Ball, Button, and Auto Part. Temporally significant attributes are described as Datable Attributes such as Creamware: Edges, Pearlware: Mocha, Whiteware: Flow Blue, Wrought [nail], and Cut [nail]. An additional descriptive level is provided under the Descriptor category, which includes such information as coin dates, pipe stem bore diameters, glass color, and vessel part. Each artifact category is further recorded by count and in the case of brick and shell also by weight. The results of analysis will be tabulated in a comprehensive inventory by context.

Building on the results of the basic analysis and inventory, more specific studies of the historic artifact assemblage can be conducted to better understand site structure, function, and age. For example, the distributions of various "Groups" and "Classes" of artifacts across the site can be analyzed to identify various activity areas and structural loci. The approximate time spans of availability of certain temporally sensitive artifacts can indicate the range of occupation for the site. Differential distributions of temporally diagnostic artifacts representing different periods of occupation of the site can potentially reveal changes in site structure over time. Features or discrete, intact cultural deposits may be assigned a terminus post quem (TPQ) date, where the quantities of associated temporally diagnostic artifacts allow. This represents a data after which the earliest possible dates of availability for the youngest diagnostic artifact(s) in the context.

2: Cultural Contexts

OVERVIEW OF AREA PREHISTORY

This prehistoric context represents a summary discussion of each of the major periods or stages defined by archaeologists for Virginia. The goal is to characterize the important patterns that distinguish one division from another—in other words, to describe the hallmarks of these periods (Figure 2). At the most basic level, the trends cited are generally exhibited across the Mid-Atlantic region, but the emphasis here is placed on describing local expressions of prehistoric cultures. Where available, information from local sites is presented to enhance the specific discussion of City Point's prehistory.

Paleoindian Stage (before ca. 8000 BC)

Paleoindian groups occupied the region during the last two millennia of the Pleistocene, a period when “megafauna” such as ground sloth, bison, and mastodons roamed North America. Paleoindians have been characterized as large game hunters utilizing limited floral resources. However, evidence of a mixed deciduous/coniferous and boreal forest during this period, as well as evidence of Holocene fauna coexisting with soon-to-be-extinct Pleistocene forms suggests that Paleoindian groups in the Eastern Woodlands relied more heavily on generalized foraging than previously accepted.

The peoples of the Paleoindian period in Virginia have generally been characterized as selectively mobile populations, operating within a prescribed territory, but with an eventual return to a central base (Gardner 1977:261; Turner 1989:77). Based on the Flint Run Complex settlement system, their nomadism was not necessarily seasonally oriented, but was to some degree tied to tool kit depletion and social factors. Studies of known Paleoindian sites,

especially Flint Run and Williamson, and studies tracing specific cherts and jaspers back to original source locations, have consistently documented a recurring emphasis on high-quality lithic sources and a focus on wide-ranging foraging, rather than collecting subsistence patterns. This suggests a settlement pattern of “tethered nomadism” (Custer and Wallace 1982:163; Turner 1989:82).

Approximately 20 Paleoindian sites had been documented for the Coastal Plain of Virginia by 1984, and between 50 and 75 sites for all of Virginia in 1988 (Turner 1989:78). Thirteen isolated Paleoindian points have been recovered within Prince George County (Anonymous 1982:36; McCary 1983:68).

Archaic Stage (ca. 8000–1000 BC)

After ca. 9000 BC, patterns of subsistence and settlement began to diverge from typical “Paleoindian” lifeways (Custer 1990:34). Changes in the climate associated with the advent of an essentially modern Holocene environment, as well as the contemporaneous overall rise in sea level due to glacial melting, facilitated the continued development of such resource areas as the Great Dismal Swamp and other freshwater marshes, primarily in the Outer Coastal Plain. The rise of freshwater marshes contributed to a change in subsistence that began to focus more on seasonal collecting and mobility patterns, and use of aquatic resources in the Coastal Plain. A shift also began toward the use of more readily available quartz and quartzite materials, with a decreasing dependence upon chert and jasper materials (Hunter and Higgins 1985:9). Egloff (1989:1) notes that outcroppings of quartzite cobbles along stream terraces in the vicinity of the fall line provided raw materials for tool production particularly


Stage	Period	Years BP	Subsistence	Organization	Hallmarks	
Paleoindian		12,000	Hunting and gathering	Dispersed bands		
	Archaic	Early Archaic		10,000	Bands	
		Middle Archaic		8,500		
	Late Archaic	5,000	Intensified hunting and gathering	Intensified hunting and gathering		
Woodland	Early Woodland	3,200				
	Middle Woodland	2,500	Hunting and gathering with incipient horticulture	Tribes		
	Late Woodland	1,100	Horticulture with hunting and gathering	Tribes/ chiefdoms		
Historic		400	European contact and colonization			
		0				

Figure 2. Hallmarks of prehistoric periods in Virginia.

during the Late Archaic. Furthermore, quarry sites and workshop sites for tool manufacture dating to the Late Archaic are located along the fall line.

Evidence of such workshops occurs just west of City Point near the Route 10 crossing of the Apomattox River. Excavations at Site 44PG381 revealed the remains of workshop activity areas where quartzite cobbles were being fashioned into hafted bifaces of the Savannah River type. This is the artifact type most commonly associated with the Late Archaic period (McLearen 1991:91); regionally it is the most frequently found artifact of the period. The Savannah River tradition represents a shift toward larger and heavier projectile points, emphasis on percussion flaking, and a preference for coarser materials, such as quartzite instead of chert or quartz (McLearen 1991:95).

During the Late Archaic period, from approximately 3000 BC to 1000 BC, activities continued to become more focused around rivers and estuaries (Catlin et al. 1982; Gardner 1987), and subsistence patterns were also more focused on fish and shellfish. (Gardner 1982, 1987). There are indications that growing populations led to more diffused settlement groups (Amick 1987; Hoffman 1986).

Woodland Stage

(ca. 1100 BC – AD 1607)

The Woodland period has been defined as beginning with the introduction of pottery into the region, perhaps as early as 1100 BC (Gardner 1982). This period can also be characterized by increasing numbers of small permanent or semipermanent settlements. Factors instrumental in the increase in sedentism probably have their roots in the Archaic and the changing Holocene environment. These include increased efficiency and focus in exploiting localized resources; the development of social institutions that encouraged the production of surplus goods; and the stabilization of particular habitats that allowed for the radiation of important food resources. These factors, combined with a favorable habitat, the growth of storage technology, and the establishment of outlying exploitative camps that allowed for the expansion of the local resource base,

would have been adequate for the establishment of a sedentary lifestyle (Gardner 1982:56).

The development of the bow and arrow facilitated hunting efficiency. Ceramic vessels became important for the cooking and storage of food. Settlement occurred most often on well-drained alluvial features proximate to the confluence of smaller tributaries and the river. McLearen (1987) noted that the most intensive pre-Woodland occupations tend to be located on the upper terraces, but subsequently the lower landforms were preferred. The permanence of occupations increased with time, but it was only in the latest Woodland period that a semblance of year-round settlement emerged. By the Late Woodland period, populations developed a subsistence strategy based on the cultivation of beans, corn, squash, and tobacco (Gardner 1982). Settlement size varied from large villages to smaller hamlets, and the location of fertile soils became an increasingly important factor in settlement location.

By the onset of the Late Woodland period (AD 900–1600), it is widely recognized that increased sedentism and social complexity within the Coastal Plain region led to more established communities and more centralized political control. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, Powhatan was the leader of approximately 31 tribes within the coastal plain region (Turner 1992:115). His chiefdom extended east of the fall line along the Virginia Coastal Plain in addition to the southern half of the Delmarva Peninsula (Rountree 1989).

Local evidence of Late Woodland occupation was found at Site 44PG381. Though this component of the site was somewhat disturbed, posthole remnants indicated the presence of at least two structures. Even though ceramic artifacts from the site date quite late in this period, Captain John Smith's map (first published in 1612) does not depict a settlement nearby on the south side of the river (Figure 3). The Late Woodland component of Site 44PG381 may have been part of a "dispersed community" that preceded the villages Smith shows on the north side of the river (Stuck et al. 1997:187)

Ethnographic data from the seventeenth century has increased our knowledge of Protohistoric occupations of the area. Evidence from Smith's map has

is one of Virginia's unfortunate "burned counties" where many court records were destroyed during the Civil War. However, some surviving antebellum deeds and surveyor's records yielded information about the earlier history of the Prince Henry Avenue property. Information about the Pierce Street lots came from tax maps at the City real estate assessor's office. Several plats of the Eppes family's City Point property at the Virginia Historical Society document land use during the nineteenth century. A cursory search of some of the Eppes Family Muniments at the historical society suggested the potential wealth of information available from that vast manuscript collection. A handful of rare books in the society's collection provided further details as well as some seldom-seen illustrations of City Point during the Civil War (Holmes 1950; Kennard 1865). The Library of Virginia's map collection also yielded useful information about the development of City Point before the Civil War. The principal secondary sources for this research include a guidebook compiled by the New Deal Writers' Program (1939), Francis Lutz's (1957) history of Hopewell and Prince George County, a more recent pictorial essay of City Point/Hopewell history by Calos et al. (1993), and historical information in a National Park Service report of archaeological testing at Appomattox Manor (Blades 1988).

Prior to European contact, City Point's location between two large rivers already made it an attractive place to settle. Evidence of occupation over the last 8,000 years occurs at the few nearby archaeological sites that have been investigated. Besides serving as transportation arteries, the rivers were a source of large cobbles from which prehistoric native peoples fashioned stone tools (Blades 1988; Stuck et al. 1997). European settlers also valued the rivers for local transportation. Their single-minded economic focus on tobacco for transoceanic export also made City Point uniquely desirable as a transshipment center. Deep water along the James provided an excellent anchorage for ships that would increase in size during the colonial period and beyond.

Shortly after the English arrived in Virginia in 1607, a small party stopped briefly at City Point while exploring the James River. Despite a local tra-

dition that they considered settling at City Point rather than Jamestown, George Percy makes no mention of this in his account of the trip written the same year (Blades 1988:2; Lutz 1957:3-4; Tyler 1959 [1907]:3-23). Permanent English settlement did not reach the area until 1611, when Sir Thomas Dale established Henrico a few miles further up the James River. In 1612 Dale also started a settlement at Bermuda Hundred on the north side of the Appomattox and Bermuda City, which has often been associated with City Point.

Over the last century, City Point has not been the only site associated with Bermuda City (also later called Charles City). Others have suggested a site near Broadway Landing where Cabin Creek empties into the Appomattox River. Based on a careful reading of original documents and information from recently discovered sources, we propose that Bermuda/Charles City was built sometime between 1614 and 1616 at City Point. After the Powhatan Indians' coordinated attack on English settlements in 1622, the City Point area probably was abandoned. Whether City Point was resettled soon after is uncertain, though some investors of the Virginia Company declared this should be a high priority in reasserting English control. It is possible that a second settlement was established near Cabin Creek, as suggested by the references to the stream in early land records as Charles City or City Creek.

Charles City originated with Thomas Dale's effort in 1612 to settle the area along the James River between Farrars Island and Eppes Island. Two centers anchored this new area of settlement that Dale felt was most promising for the future of the English venture in Virginia. Henrico (now interpreted as the City of Henricus) was a densely settled area on the western end of Farrars Island. The other major focus Dale christened the New Bermudas. According to an account by Ralph Hamor dating to 1614, this included the area known as Bermuda (or Nether) Hundred on the south side of the James as well as Sherly Hundred (near current Shirley Plantation), Upper Hundred, and Digges Hundred on the north bank. By reading Hamor's account alone we may be misled to believe that Bermuda City never existed as a separate community because he uses this term to refer to the entire eastern portion

of Dale's settlement project. Indeed, one important scholarly study of colonial town planning makes this assumption (Reps 1972:43). Only two years later, however, the separate designation "Bermuda town" appears in an account by John Rolfe, the celebrated husband of Pocahontas. Rolfe implies that this "town" constituted the defensive center of nearby "Bermuda Nether Hundred" and "West and Sherley Hundred." Resembling City Point's commanding topography, Bermuda town was "so called there by reason of the strength of the situation, were it indifferently fortified" (Rolfe 1616 in Haile 1998:870). Here Rolfe suggests exceptional natural defenses like the high bluffs and clear views of all the major shipping lanes on both the Appomattox and the James rivers. Neither Shirley nor Bermuda Hundred, with their lower bluffs and low plain, respectively, fit this characterization. Another description, dating just before the Powhatan Indian uprising of 1622, occurs in the discussion by the Virginia Company about where to locate a school proposed by the Rev. Patrick Copeland. Of Virginia's "fower Citties" (or boroughs of Henrico, Charles, James, Kecoughtan), Charles City was chosen partly because of its "holesomnes of Aire," implying an elevated site like City Point (Kingsbury 1906-1935:539-540). A recent assessment of English and native archaeological sites from this period also interpreted the location of Bermuda/Charles City at City Point based on some of these suggestive descriptions (Turner and Opperman 2000:4-21).

Fortunately, more concrete evidence has surfaced for locating Bermuda/Charles City. The community appears on an early seventeenth-century Dutch chart of the James River discovered in the mid-1990s. Johannes Vingboons, a professional cartographer who worked for the Dutch East India and West India companies, probably drafted the chart about 1639. Scholars believe the chart represents English settlement as it appeared in the spring of 1617. Vingboons likely derived the information from an English mariner's chart made about that time (Jarvis and van Driel 1997:379, 385). Even at first glance, the chart strikes the modern viewer with its accuracy compared to other early seventeenth-century maps of the region (Smith 1612; Tindall 1608). Solid evidence of the chart's reliability has

been borne out by recent excavations at Jamestown, which uncovered archaeological remains of a fort very close to the location labeled by Vingboons (Jarvis and van Driel 1997:392). The chart erases any doubts about the separate existence of Bermuda City by 1617 and its location at City Point. Vingboons depicts three house-like buildings labeled "Bermotho Citie" between Bailey's Creek and the Appomattox River (Figure 4). Obviously, these are symbolic rather than actual representations of structures and the size of the settlement. Comparing the City Point area with other portions of the chart, these symbols do not seem to represent exact relative size of settlements (at some named locations that would have been settled by 1617 there are no house symbols). On the other hand, the symbols provide some general information about the settlement. Compared to Jamestown and Kecoughtan, each apparently represented by a fortification symbol, Bermuda City appears to have been more dispersed. The symbols also suggest the City Point community was more tightly clustered and less populated than its neighbor "Bermotho Hundred" across the Appomattox.

Supplementing this valuable map, we have key information from another recently discovered primary source. In the mid-1990s, researchers found a Virginia census dating to 1619 among the Ferrar manuscripts at Cambridge University. The census confirms that the community at City Point, newly renamed Charles City, was quite small. Only 27 men, seven women, and three children lived there, whereas the Charles/Bermuda Hundred area had a total population of 184. These settlers had only one bull and three kine at their disposal, much fewer relative to the population than the two largest population centers at Charles Hundred and Jamestown. None of Virginia's 11 horses were available to the settlers at Charles City (McCartney 1999:181, 182).

After 1619, the story of Charles City becomes more challenging to unravel. In the wake of the devastating native uprising of 1622, different factions of Virginia's administration sought to lay blame for English losses. Former Virginia Company Treasurer Sir Thomas Smythe had been pressured to resign in 1619. His supporters portrayed the




Figure 4. Portion of Vingboons' (1639 [1617]) chart of the James River showing the location of "Bermotho Citie" at City Point. The dispersed house symbols contrast with the representations of fortified Jamestown (lower left) and Kecoughtan (lower right).

pre-1622 settlements in glowing terms, emphasizing what the succeeding administration had squandered through poor planning and defense. On the other hand, friends of Smythe's successor Sir Edwin Sandys minimized what had been lost and proposed measures to strengthen the Virginia settlements (Haile 1998:891). As a result, from 1619 to the post-1622 era, we have widely contradictory accounts of Virginia, and by extension Charles City.

Perhaps the most reliable information for this period comes from an inventory of casualties. During the attack, five men "of Capt. Smith's Company" were listed as killed at Charles City. A more detailed but controversial description comes from a pamphlet by the governor of Bermuda, Capt. Nathaniel Butler, who visited the area sometime in 1622-1623:

I found the Antient Planters of Henrico and Charles City wholly quitted and lefte to the spoile of the Indians, who not onely burned the houses saide to be once the best of all others, but fell uppon the Poultry, Hoggs, Cowes, Goates and Horses wherof they killed great numbers to the greate griefe as well as ruine of the Olde Inhabitants, whoe stick not to affirme that these were not onely the best and healthiest parts of all others, but might allsoe by their naturall strength of scituacion have been the most easefully preserved of all the rest (Kingsbury 1906-1935:II:374).

Butler's description of Virginia generated such controversy that former planters of the Virginia Company attended a meeting in London to refute the allegations point by point. They responded to most of the items but left this portrayal of Henrico and Charles City for the reaction of the governor and other residents of Virginia. Their response could not have been more damning of Butler and painted a bleak picture of Charles City:

Henrico was quitted in Sir Thomas Smith's time, only the Church and one House remaining. *Charles City*, so much spoken of never had but six Houses. The Soil of both is barren, worn out, and not fit for Culture. The loss of our stocks the Informer hath less Reason to urge. For he joined with the Indians in killing our Cattle, and carried the Beef aboard his Ship (McIlwaine 1915:25).

It is difficult to balance the two accounts when one narrator accuses the other of being not only a liar, but a cattle thief! Still, we can conclude that

the settlement remained quite small and even may have declined between the 1619 census and 1622. Plans to rebuild and strengthen the settlements in the 1620s, however, suggest the potential importance of Charles City to Virginia's future. Company planners lamented the "relinquishing of Charles Cittie," along with Henrico and the ironworks at Falling Creek, as "not only of discontent, but of evill fame." Reestablishing these settlements was "of absolute necessitie..." (Kingsbury 1906-1935: III:670). Despite the urgent tone, Charles City is absent from a census of Virginia made that year (Meyer and Dorman 1987). Apparently, the settlement never was reestablished at City Point.

Even though new evidence locates Charles City at City Point, we should also evaluate older arguments pointing to the Broadway area as the site. In a 1942 article, Charles Gilliam devoted a page of notes contending that City Point could not be the location of Charles City. His evidence rested largely on the early community's location relative to the mouth of the Appomattox River. According to Gilliam's interpretation of a 1643 act of the General Assembly, the mouth of the river was then considered to lie west of City Point between Cawsons and Buzzard Island. Accordingly, he considered Broadway Landing, near the mouth of current Cabin Creek, as the likely site of Charles City. Gilliam also noted that early land records refer to that stream as "The Charles City Creek" or "City Creek." Furthermore, until the Civil War the seventeenth-century "City Church" stood at the edge of the creek about a half mile inland from the Appomattox River (Gilliam 1942:339-340).

In his 1957 master's thesis on colonial Prince George County, Shepard de Hart expanded on Gilliam's insights and concluded that Broadway Landing was the site of ancient Charles City. Close reading of early documents, however, reveals that de Hart misread some of his key evidence. In an accounting of the casualties of the 1622 uprising, Company officials noted that Charles City was 5 miles from Berkeley Hundred. Rather than supporting de Hart's claim for Broadway Landing as the site, this information verifies City Point as the more likely location. Broadway Landing is some 3 miles further west, whereas City Point is almost exactly 5

miles from Berkeley (de Hart 1957:164; Kingsbury 1906-1935:III:567). Following the destruction of the 1622 attack, the Company proposed rebuilding many houses and fortifications in brick rather than wood. A misleading quote in the thesis implies that only the soils at Charles City were especially “fitt to make brick,” and therefore the soil types at Broadway made it a more likely candidate for the site (de Hart 1957:164; Kingsbury 1906-1935:260-262). In fact, the original passage states that almost all of Virginia had suitable soil for brick-making. A complete reading of the document also adds evidence perhaps more favorable to City Point as the site for Charles City. Both Henrico and Charles City “stood upon high ground the Cliffes being steepe, but of a clay mould.” City Point’s high bluffs conform more closely to this description than Broadway.

Gilliam and de Hart’s evidence that Broadway was the original site of Charles City is unconvincing, especially in light of the chart and census discovered in the 1990s. Nevertheless, their discussion of early names associated with the Broadway area suggests intriguing possibilities that a focus of settlement may have shifted there sometime between the 1620s and 1640s. With Francis Eppes’ personal patent taking up 1,700 acres at City Point by 1635, Broadway may have become a more likely area for a small community. Certainly, the location of a nearby “City” church suggests a significant center of activity.

By 1634, the more established colony was subdivided into political units called shires, the predecessors of many current Tidewater counties. City Point fell within Charles City Shire; the portion of the shire on the south side of the James became Prince George County in 1703 (Doran 1987:16). The year after the formation of the shire, Francis Eppes claimed his 1,700-acre tract that encompassed City Point. At least part of this land would remain in the family’s ownership until 1979 when the National Park Service purchased Appomattox Manor. Through the system of headrights, which entitled settlers to 50 acres of land for each person they transported to the colony, Eppes received a grant from the crown giving him clear title to the

property. Often settlers claimed a grant while they already occupied the land, so Eppes may have resided at City Point some time prior to 1635. Archaeological investigations by the National Park Service during the 1980s uncovered evidence of a structure that may be associated with this first Eppes. The excavated deposits fall within a date range of 1620 to 1650 (Blades 1988).

Advertisements in the *Virginia Gazette* give some clues about activity at City Point during the eighteenth century. The waterfront along the James became established as a small port. In September 1756, several ships lay at anchor off City Point. An advertisement offered indentures for 70 Irish indentured servants in return for paying their passage (*Va. Gazette* 1773). Eilbeck, Ross & Company advertised that the ship *Industry*, “now lying at City Point, bound for London” would take tobacco “on liberty of consignment” (*Va. Gazette* 1772). Although the firm would receive orders at Norfolk, Richmond, and Petersburg, it apparently had no office or warehouse set up at City Point. Instead, the company’s agent was stationed aboard the ship, indicating more basic facilities at this port.

An architectural summary of the City Point historic district documents only a handful of structures dating to the eighteenth century. Appomattox Manor, the plantation house of the Eppes family, was probably built around 1750 (Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission 1978). Within the bounds of the old village on the east side of Prince Henry Avenue, the City Point House tentatively dates to the eighteenth century. It may have served as a tavern during the colonial period (Writers’ Program 1939:26). Diagonally opposite, another tavern owned by the Eppes family once stood during the eighteenth century. According to local tradition, this tavern served briefly as the county courthouse (Works Progress Administration of Virginia [WPA Va.] 1937b). Even though the structure probably was destroyed before the Civil War, land transactions through the end of the twentieth century referred to the parcel at the corner of current Maplewood Avenue and Prince Henry Avenue as “the old tavern lot.”

During the Revolution, only one limited engagement occurred at City Point. In January 1781, General Benedict Arnold, the former patriot, led a British expedition overland from Westover to Richmond. Several British privateers followed the expedition and captured cargo vessels laden with tobacco that had fled upriver. Militia under Col. John Banister forced the privateers to retreat without their prizes. As the British sailed down the river past City Point, American forces fired on them with ships' guns mounted on the promontory near Appomattox Manor. During the skirmish, a British shell struck the Eppes' house but did not cause major damage (Lutz 1957:89).

As the new nation established an infrastructure of postal service and customs inspection in the late eighteenth century, the port of City Point attracted interest from the Federal government. At first these offices were located across the Appomattox River at Bermuda Hundred. When the collector of customs moved his office to City Point in 1797, apparently the post office followed (even though the postmark continued to read "Bermuda Hundred" until 1801) (WPA Va. 1937a). Accordingly, City Point appears frequently in the senate records of official appointments. In 1811, for example, President James Madison nominated John H. Peterson as the surveyor for the Petersburg and Richmond districts and inspector of revenue for those ports, but he was to reside at City Point or Bermuda Hundred (U.S. Senate 1828:174). In 1842, when President John Tyler presented William P. Porter to the senate for the same post, he mentioned the same residence options (U.S. Senate 1887:153). The records of the House of Representatives also suggest that City Point was considered a suitable location for other federal investment. In 1836, a Rhode island representative who sat on the commerce committee introduced an appropriation bill for \$8,000 that would benefit City Point. The funds were intended for a marine hospital. No further details about construction were discovered, although an entry in a Virginia gazetteer the same year may refer to it (H.R. 625, 11 May 1836; Martin 1836:270).

Beginning in the 1820s, various business interests attempted to capitalize on City Point's strategic location. In 1825, the Lower Appomattox

Company was formed to dredge that river and allow access to larger ships. Even though the anchorage on the James was excellent, the company's opening of this large tributary would heighten City Point's importance as a transportation center. Eagerly anticipating increased shipping, other investors sought to establish the collection of wharves and houses at City Point as a municipality (Lutz 1957:122). On February 17, 1826, an act of Virginia's General Assembly incorporated the town of City Point. Prominent local landowners like the Cocke and Batte families sat on the board of trustees, which was empowered to subdivide the 50-acre town into lots, pass bylaws, and levy taxes. Lot owners needed only to build a 12-ft.-square dwelling with a masonry chimney to enjoy the full rights of a town freeholder (WPA Va. 1936).

For City Point to thrive as a port in the nineteenth century, it would need a railroad—the era's cutting-edge technology. Railroads were beginning to crisscross the nation and promoters at City Point correctly foresaw their importance. The beleaguered state of the Lower Appomattox Company also made a railroad advisable if City Point was to attract large ships. Floods had plagued progress on the dredging project, while shallow-draft flatboats (exempt from tolls) limited the company's revenues. (Lutz 1957:127–128). In 1836, the House of Delegates approved a charter for the City Point Railroad Company and two years later the first train made a run from City Point to Petersburg (Lutz 1957:132) (Figure 5). It was only the second railroad in the Commonwealth. Already at this early date, City Point enjoyed the combination of rail connection and deep water port that General Grant and later the Du Pont company would find so attractive.

Despite these improvements, City Point remained a sleepy village for much of the nineteenth century. Except for the massive military influx in 1864, City Point's population did not permanently rise above 300 until Du Pont's arrival in the early twentieth century. Ten years after the town's incorporation, visitors were unimpressed. One actor passing through the village snidely remarked, "I could see neither city nor point" (Tyrone Power, quoted in Lutz 1957:123). The author of an 1836 gazetteer did his best to sound upbeat about the port




Figure 5. Sketch of first train leaving City Point in 1838 (Lutz 1957:132).

facilities, but the village was “inconsiderable” and “a place of no trade except in a small retail way.” Still, the writer recognized City Point’s potential. Within 30 yards of the wharves there was “a sufficient depth of water to swim the largest ship that ever floated.” Expansion of the port would depend on further development of the railroad and completion of navigation improvements along the James and Kanawha rivers. At the time, City Point had a population of about 100 and consisted of 25 houses, three taverns, three grocery stores, a school, and a hospital (Martin 1836:270).

Two maps of City Point combine to give a sense of the layout of the village and port during this period. In 1837, engineer John Couty drafted a plan and profile for the track of the City Point Railroad. Although the map traces the track as far as Petersburg, the depiction of City Point is fairly detailed (Couty 1837) (Figure 6). Overlaying the plan on a current map suggests (understandably) that Couty represented the area near the railroad grade with greater accuracy than the rest of City Point (Figure 7). Several streets appear along with lot outlines and selected structures. A map drawn in 1844 provides

a far more schematic sense of the village layout but adds other details about the port’s resources (Prince George Legislative Petition 1844) (Figure 8). Eight houses and/or warehouses sit at the foot of the bluff along the waterfront. Across the road, seven wharves and a railroad depot line the riverbank. Among the labels indicating owners, the surname of one of the 1826 trustees (Cocke) appears both along the waterfront and next to a prominent dwelling on the high ground above. Several dwellings “on the hill” are clustered along Main Street, the early name for Prince Henry Avenue. Between Main Street and the waterfront below, the draftsman also depicted “Moody’s Hotel.” Ten years after incorporation, many of the City

Point lots remained vacant.

Away from the waterfront area on the 1837 map, the most prominent feature is a straight, tree-lined road (present Cedar Lane) leading to Appomattox Manor. Despite investors’ dreams of development, a large portion of the point of land known as City Point was dominated by the Eppes’ plantation house grounds and surrounding agricultural lands (Pillow and Pillow 1856) (Figure 9). Much of the history of City Point, then, is inextricably linked to the story of this plantation. By the mid-nineteenth century, Appomattox Manor was at the center of a vast domain that included more than 937 acres at City Point and Hopewell Farm, 677 acres across the James at the Eppes Island Plantation, and 787 acres at the “Bermuda Hundreds” Plantation (Blades 1988:36–37). (Figure 10). In 1860, a work force of 112 slaves toiled on the farms’ wheat crops, tended livestock, and served in the Appomattox Manor household (Bowman 1988:44). Although Dr. Richard Eppes considered himself a progressive farmer and enlightened slave owner, his plantation journals reveal the pervasive brutality of slavery. While depriving his human property of basic freedoms and compensation for their labor, Eppes hoped to increase slave productivity by offering small monetary incentives. In 1856, for example, he handed out a total of \$96.90 to 59 slaves for obedience and




Figure 6. Portion of "A map and profile of the City Point Railroad" (Couty 1837).



Figure 7. Current street plan of City Point overlaid with features from Couty's (1837) map.




Figure 8. Map of City Point (Prince George Legislative Petition 1844).

for delivering chopped wood to his house (Nicholls 1988:68, 73). Countering these meager rewards, however, was a draconian “Code of Laws” that Eppes drafted for the slaves on his Island Plantation. Besides the special rules for foremen, the code included 15 offenses, most of them punishable by flogging. Some punishments were even more humiliating. For fighting, slaves were stripped naked and locked in a room where they would whip each other until ordered to stop (Nicholls 1988:75). While the majority of the slave population lived on the outlying farms, a slave quarter was located just west of the City Point village. Other slave cabins may have stood below the house along the riverbank. In a 1950 memoir, a visitor to City Point recalled seeing remnants of slave cabins there in the early twentieth century (Holmes 1950:43).

Early in the Civil War, a brief skirmish occurred at City Point between some Georgia infantry and Union naval officers and seamen. On May 19, 1862,

the Union officers and seamen had gone ashore to give medical care at the request of some local residents. Approaching the village with white flags flying above several houses, the Union men came under fire and three seamen were killed. The navy gunboats responded with a brief bombardment which caused some damage to Appomattox Manor and Weston Manor a little further west. No further action occurred until May 1864 when the Army of the James headed upriver under Maj. Gen. Benjamin Butler’s command (Calos et al. 1993:17–18). The first goal was to occupy City Point as a staging area. From City Point Butler could attack Richmond and chase Lee’s army while Gen. George Meade’s Army of the Potomac attacked from the north. Commanding General Ulysses S. Grant hoped to trap Lee’s army and end the war. The plan did not materialize and the Confederate army became entrenched at Petersburg (Lutz 1957:170–172). For the next year, City Point would become a massive




Figure 9. Plat of Eppes plantation (Pillow and Pillow 1856).

Point to Petersburg, the freshly baked bread was still warm when it arrived at the front (Calos et al. 1993:24). This luxury must have lifted the morale of the Union troops considerably, especially as their Confederate enemy suffered near-starvation rations during the later stages of the siege. Much of this supply infrastructure appears on a detailed map made by the Union army in 1865. The location of one small structure shown on the map coincides with a large filled pit (Feature 8) found on the archaeological site at Prince Henry Avenue (Figures 15 and 16). The busy rail terminal near the waterfront appears in several illustrations.

City Point itself was never seriously threatened by the Confederates during the Petersburg campaign. In case of a counterattack, however, the Union built a series of earthworks and forts on the western limits of

military installation as the Union army laid siege to Petersburg.

Numerous contemporary illustrations depict the scale of military activity at City Point (Figures 11–14). The deep anchorage received supplies of weapons, ammunition, and other provisions for the army. The scale of activity was staggering. Gazing over the water on a busy day, one might see “some forty steamboats, seventy-five sailing vessels, and one hundred barges” (Trudeau 1991:132). A large military hospital was also built along the Appomattox, stretching eastward from the current Route 10 bridge. Originally designed for 6,000 patients, the hospital housed as many as 10,000 sick and wounded in 1865 (Calos et al. 1993:29). Union facilities also included an abattoir for butchering livestock and a large bakery. With a direct rail connection from City

their vast depot. A map completed just after the war illustrates a two-tiered system of fortification. Forts Abbott, McKeen, Graves, Merriam, and Porter were connected by earthworks to form an outer line of defense about 2 mi. west of City Point proper (Michler 1867) (Figure 17). A reserve artillery captain from Maine reported in March 1865 that the four regiments manning these works had at least 22 field guns at their disposal (Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies 1895:275–276). East of these defenses was a line of earthworks connecting two forts. Roughly oriented east-west, the line converged eastward toward the terminus of the railroad. The westernmost fort appears to match the location of earthworks in the park study area on East Broadway.




Figure 10. Dr. Richard Eppes' landholdings in 1860 (from Blades 1988:37).



Figure 11. Painting of military activity along the James River waterfront (Henry 1864).




Figure 12. Military locomotive at the City Point depot (Kennard 1865:between pp. 20, 21).



Figure 13. Docks at City Point, James River, Va., July 5, 1864 (stereograph by Timothy O'Sullivan, Library of Congress digital i.d. nhnycw/ad ad35025; original in possession of New York Historical Society).



Figure 14. The James River at City Point [Stereograph] Brady & Co. (Washington, D.C.), Library of Congress digital i.d. number nhnycw/ad ad35008; original in possession of New York Historical Society).




Figure 15. Map of Union army infrastructure at City Point (Quartermaster General's Office 1865)



Figure 16. Current street plan of City Point overlaid with features from Quartermaster General's Office (1865) map.




Figure 17. "Map of Bermuda Hundred" showing Union defenses around City Point (Michler 1867).



Figure 18. Wharves at City Point after the explosion of ordnance barges on August 9, 1864 (Library of Congress digital i.d. cwpb 03926 <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/cwpb.03926>).



Figure 19. Decayed wharves along the James River waterfront in the late nineteenth century (Calos et al. 1993:40).

Despite these measures, City Point's defenses were not airtight. "Irregular operations" occurred on both sides of the front as scouts and spies passed back and forth. Even though the vast supply base at City Point seemed relatively secure for a war zone, two dramatic Confederate incursions illustrate its vulnerability. A swift surprise attack could overrun the small forces assigned to defend the inner line. During the so-called "Beefsteak Raid" of September 1864, Gen. Wade Hampton led his forces behind Union lines to the cattle corral at Cocke's Mill, several miles east of City Point. The thinly guarded line in this area included only 1,400 men protecting a 15-mi. stretch of defenses. Once through the line, Hampton's men quickly dispersed the forces tending the livestock and managed to herd more than 2,400 head of cattle back to the Confederate lines (Trudeau 1991:194–195; West 2001).

Only a month earlier, on August 9, 1864, a pair of Confederate agents had devastated part of the port at City Point by exploding a time bomb on an ordnance barge (Figure 18). John Maxwell did not even board the vessel to set the device. He simply handed his "horological torpedo" to a laborer who carried it aboard for him. The explosion killed 43 people, wounded 126, and caused more than \$2 million worth of property damage. Despite the heavy toll, the buildings and wharves were quickly rebuilt and the explosion had little long-term impact on the Union's operations. Ironically, it was not known until after the war that the explosion was an act of sabotage rather than an accident (Trudeau 1991:134–141).

Following the Civil War, the military presence quickly dwindled. From a bustling military town, City Point was again transformed into a quiet village. Photographs of City Point during the late nineteenth century illustrate the return to a slower pace (Calos et al. 1993:40) (Figure 19). Along the waterfront, only rotting pilings recalled the immense wharves that received supplies during the Union occupation. A small vestige of the Federal military remained, however, as several Monitor-class ships were stationed along the Appomattox. Many of the sailors manning the vessels were Irish immigrants. To serve this small community of Catholics, the Petersburg diocese built St. Dennis Chapel on Brown Avenue. Otherwise the sailors would have needed to travel to Petersburg for worship (Jim Micklum, personal communication 2002). Eventually, even the Monitor ships left City Point, bringing the Federal presence to a close.

City Point remained largely unchanged through the beginning of the twentieth century. In 1910, the population still stood at 300, as it had just before the Civil War. But City Point was about to undergo one of the most dramatic transformations in urban history. In 1912, the E.I. Du Pont de Nemours Company purchased 1,800 acres of the Eppes' Hopewell Farm just south of the village of City Point. The deep port, rail connections, and large water supply impressed the company's representatives. Immediately, the firm began building a dynamite plant on the site, fulfilling the elusive dreams of urban and industrial growth that had fueled the halting investments of the early nine-




Figure 20. Plat of Du Pont era neighborhoods (Du Pont 1918).

teenth century. As World War I broke out, the operation shifted to the production of guncotton, an ingredient in the smokeless powder for artillery pieces (Lutz 1957:225–226). Demand from the killing fields of Western Europe spurred a massive expansion of the Du Pont facilities. The need for workers quickly outstripped the local labor pool. By 1916, a rapid influx of workers had swelled the population to 40,000. Although Du Pont invested heavily in housing and other infrastructure for its workers, further action was needed to meet the needs of this booming community. On February 26, 1916, the General Assembly approved a charter for the City of Hopewell (Lutz 1957:233). Although City Point was not annexed by Hopewell until 1923, the new town's sprawling development extended into the older community (Figure 20).

Establishing a city government, however, did not transform Hopewell into a typical, quiet Virginia town. Instead early Hopewell stands apart with its cosmopolitan atmosphere and freewheeling permissiveness. Job opportunities with Du Pont and in the thriving service businesses drew large numbers of foreign immigrants, many from Greece, Italy, and Turkey. As many as 35 languages were spoken among the factory work force, prompting Du Pont to offer “round-the-clock” English classes (Crump 1981:40). Immigrant-owned businesses gave Hopewell the exotic flair of Manhattan or San Francisco. A stroll down Hopewell's streets might lead past Russian and Greek restaurants (Crump 1981:42), an Italian bakery, or groceries run by the Syrian Fayed brothers. In a brochure produced by the board of trade, the promoters soothed their readers' potential prejudices against foreigners. The brief articles on these foreign-owned businesses emphasized the length of time the owners had lived in the United States. In one case, the article even specified that the shopkeepers were “loyal to America and American institutions” (Weaver ca. 1916:24, 30, 37).

Alongside these legitimate businesses, Hopewell hosted some seedy and corrupt elements. Hotels like the Hopewell and the Venice allowed all-night gambling and sold illegal whiskey. The owners of these hotels also ran brothels, splitting room charges “50/50” with the prostitutes. The Coney Island and

the Bronx cabarets served up lewd dancing along with prostitution. Hopewell even sported floating brothels, including one steamboat called the *Bo-Peep* (Crump 1981:43). At the root of Hopewell's vice problem was a corrupt system of law and order. Local police accepted bribes instead of enforcing ordinances. Even without corrupt officials, law enforcement was a challenge. As one chronicler of early Hopewell observed, “It was impossible to handle a town of this size that had grown up so quick, no matter how good a police department you might have” (quoted in Crump 1981:41). Instead, the police department fueled the Wild West atmosphere. Rather than wearing uniforms, they strolled the streets in plain clothes wearing pistols. As a result, residents were hard-pressed to distinguish police from criminals. Local officials were also notorious for harassing foreign immigrants. In one case, the Italian consul from Richmond had to intervene on behalf of his fellow citizens (Crump 1981:43).

Even before incorporation, the roiling boomtown had survived disaster. On December 9, 1915, a fire raged through the Hopewell, destroying 300 buildings in its path. Miraculously, there was no loss of life (Calos et al. 1993:66–67). Despite the damage, the burned neighborhoods were quickly rebuilt. Three years later, another disturbing incident blotted the town's early history. In the fall of 1918, the African-American Davisville neighborhood was rocked by a riot. It is not clear why the fighting began, but the deadly clash culminated in gunfire between whites and local African-American residents. The mayor of Hopewell brought in local militia to break up the street battle. Sadly, the racial violence impelled more than 1,000 blacks to leave the city permanently (Calos et al. 1993:48; Lutz 1957:240–241).

At the close of World War I, Du Pont shut down its operations almost immediately. Although the former “Wonder City” lost many jobs and residents, the community was able to attract replacement industries. In fact, the departure of Du Pont made Hopewell less vulnerable to the vagaries of industrial demand as the new manufacturers made a variety of products. Foremost among the new industries were the Tubize Artificial Silk Corpora-

tion and ANCO (the earlier name for Allied Chemical) (Calos et al. 1993:93–95).

The company town atmosphere remained as manufacturers such as the Tubize Artificial Silk Corporation and other industries moved in. Many employees continued to reside in the industrial village housing built by Du Pont. Class and race largely determined where employees would live: in the “A” village for supervisors, the north “B” village for white workers, or the south “B” village for black workers (Kimball and Curry 2002:116). Employees’ leisure activities often focused around company-based clubs and organizations. One musical group even gained semiprofessional status. In 1929, the Tubize Royal Hawaiian Orchestra recorded several songs in New York and Richmond and four of the tracks were released (Kimball and Curry 2002:118). Other indications of company-based leisure activities include newsletters such as *The Tubize Spinnerette* and Du Pont’s *Hopewell Splinters*.

Despite some plant closings during the 1930s, Hopewell was not devastated by the Depression. With the onset of World War II, nearby Camp Lee added to Hopewell’s economic base by drawing thousands of military personnel to the area. The federal government had held onto the land of this former World War I base and it was quickly reactivated. Following World War II, the base was converted from a training camp to a more permanent installation, renamed Fort Lee (Lutz 1957:266–267, 277). With the nearby base and an active chemical industry, Hopewell has retained the economic vitality that surged with Du Pont’s arrival.

Prince Henry Avenue

Research among the Hopewell and Prince George County court records traced the ownership of the Prince Henry Avenue study area. Historically this parcel has been divided among several lots. Roughly the southeastern half of the parcel consists of a lot at the corner of Prince Henry Avenue and Pelham Street. The 2002 tax map of Hopewell shows that the northwestern half consists of 10 very small lots along the southeast side of Bank Street. These lots match the size of the lots on the opposite side of

that street, which are currently occupied by row houses. Prior to development in the early twentieth century, all of the small lots on both sides of Bank Street formed a single property called the “Old Tavern Lot.”

The earliest owner of the Prince Henry Avenue property was the Eppes family, who originally owned most of City Point. Due to a limited research scope and the fragmented condition of Prince George County’s pre-Civil War records, no definite documentation was found of their title to the whole parcel. Dr. Richard Eppes’ ownership of the portion along Bank Street, however, is well documented. Many of the boundary descriptions for the southeastern lot “begin at the SE corner of Dr. Richard Eppes old Tavern lot” (e.g., a deed dated 5 May 1866, Prince George County Records [PGCR] Deed Book [DB] 27:188). The earliest documented owners of the southeastern lot are Christopher Proctor and his wife Mary, In 1866, they sold 2.25 acres for \$1,137.50 to Ralph D. Curtis of City Point (PGCR DB 2:120). Prior to this transaction, the deed indexes list several larger acquisitions of land by Christopher Proctor, including at least two from Richard Eppes. Not all of these could be examined. Also, descriptions of these large tracts did not describe landmarks that could be associated with the later lot. It does appear that the Proctors divided the small lot from a larger tract before selling it to Curtis. The 1866 deed also indicates the origin of Pelham Street. One of the lot boundaries lay along “right-of-way given by the said Proctor.” Several subsequent deeds through 1880 refer to this southeastern boundary as a “40 ft. street laid out by Ralph D. Curtis” (e.g., in 1869, PGCR DB 28:234).

Less than three months after purchasing the lot from the Proctors, Ralph Curtis sold it to Charles Pierce “of City Point” for \$1,600 (16 May 1866, PGCR DB 27:188). Three years later on January 16, 1869, Pierce deeded the property to his wife Mrs. Lucy Pierce for \$850 (PGCR DB 28:234). The lot described here seems to have also included adjacent Lot 11 adjacent to the southwest. When Richard Royall sold the property to J. C. and E. T. Greene in 1922, he referred to a deed from Lucy

Pierce to Peter Phillips (PGCR DB 32: 167; 82:3). Apparently Phillips acquired Lot 11, and Pierce transferred the rest of the property to Richard Royall in an unrecorded transaction. Perhaps Lucy Pierce had remarried, to Royall, and the land passed to him through another instrument such as a will.

As mentioned above, the small lots along Bank Street were once part of an “Old Tavern” lot owned by Dr. Richard Eppes. Little is known about the eighteenth-century tavern that once stood there. Virginia historical inventory reports from the 1930s only mention its unreferenced use for early court sessions (WPA Va. 1937b). The lot’s intervening history was not traced prior to the early twentieth century.

When Du Pont began buying land at City Point around in 1912, the company may have purchased the tavern lot directly from the Eppes family. Du Pont no doubt intended to develop the land for residential use. Instead, the property was sold to the Wonder City Realty Corporation. This firm managed to build houses on the subdivided lots that lined the northwest side of Bank Street. Before the company could develop the southern half of the property, however, it was dissolved in 1920. The company’s receiver sold the lots in 1928 to a partnership of three couples known as the Brown Supply and Building Company (Hopewell City Records [HCR] DB 17:233). Still the lots remained undeveloped for more than 20 years. In 1949, the Brown Supply and Building Company relinquished control of the property.

Pierce Street

During the archaeological survey, remnants of two historic structures were discovered at the Pierce Street lots. The lot on the southwest corner of Pierce and Spruance streets yielded large numbers of architectural artifacts but none of the usual kitchen items expected at a domestic site. According to the City tax map a church once stood in the southwest corner of this lot.

Shovel testing and probing with a metal rod indicated the outline of a structure on the lots at the southeastern corner of Pierce and Spruance streets. This very likely represents the foundation of an early twentieth-century schoolhouse. The current tax map labels a no longer extant “City Point School.” According to a sketch of the history of the Patrick Copeland School, a frame structure was built here in the early 1900s to house an elementary school. By 1917, a city directory referred to this public school as the City Point Grammar School, with J. T. Erwin as its principal (Hill Directory Co., Inc. 1917:62). A detailed plan of Du Pont’s “A” village depicts the school on this lot in 1918 (see Figure 19). In 1923, the school adopted the name Patrick Copeland for an English minister who tried to establish a school at City Point in the early seventeenth century. Supporters endowed the project with gifts totaling more than £400 and the Virginia Company set aside 1,000 acres for the site. However, the project was abandoned in the confusion following the Powhatan Indian Uprising of 1622 (Lutz 1957:20–21). In 1937, a new building was erected on Appomattox Street to house the Patrick Copeland School. Another move in 2001 brought the school to its current location on Westhill Drive.

3: Prince Henry Avenue Lot

A vacant residential lot at 500 Prince Henry Avenue was the first study area investigated by the WMCAR. The generally square parcel is bounded by Bank Street on the northwest, Prince Henry Avenue on the northeast, Pelham Street on the southeast, and housing and a large ravine on the southwest (Figures 21 and 22; see Figure 1). Most of the lot consists of a trimmed lawn except for a small area in the southern corner covered in high weeds and brush. Two trees shade the southern quadrant of the lot, and two large shrubs abut the sidewalk along Prince Henry Avenue. The entire lot measures 45 m north-south \times 45 m east-west and encompasses approximately 2,025 m² or 0.2 ha (0.5 acres).

The southeastern half of the lot is generally flat until it reaches a shallow, abrupt rise that bisects the lot from southwest to northeast. The rise may denote the position of an old fence line or possibly the limits of the demolition activities that occurred during the removal of the house that stood on the southeastern portion of this lot. Beyond the rise, the ground continues level toward Bank Street.

METHODOLOGY

A grid was established over the Prince Henry Avenue study area, using iron bars placed at the northeast and southeast corners of the lot (just west of the sidewalk along Prince Henry Avenue) as permanent grid reference points. The iron bar at the northeast corner was selected as the primary elevation marker for the study area, while the bar at the southeast corner was established as 500N 500E. The grid is oriented such that grid north is 30° east of magnetic north. All subsequent directions mentioned in this chapter are relative to grid north.

Complete, systematic pedestrian survey of the study area was accomplished through surface ex-

amination and by shovel testing at intervals of 10 m. All soils were screened through quarter-inch wire mesh to ensure the adequate recovery of artifacts. Recovered artifacts were returned to the WMCAR laboratory for processing and inventory. Representative soil profiles were recorded for each shovel test and test unit. Changes in soil profiles and artifact density across the study area were recorded on a site plan as shovel testing progressed such that the loci of anomalous stratigraphy or soils, or increased relative density of artifacts could be identified.

Test unit excavation focused primarily on investigation of loci that had the highest potential for containing intact subplowzone features or cultural deposits. Indications of such potential included high relative densities of artifacts as revealed through shovel testing. Other factors influencing test unit placement include discrete concentrations of certain classes of artifacts or loci with unusual stratigraphy.

Test units were also examined for cultural features during excavation. Any anomalies considered to be potential features were recorded in plan and supplemented with black-and-white and color photography. Information about unit soils, artifacts, and stratigraphy were recorded on standardized forms and also supplemented with photography. Soils were described using standard U.S. Department of Agriculture textural terminology and Munsell soil color descriptions (Kollmorgen Instruments Corporation 1992).

Mechanical stripping of the topsoil/overburden was conducted in selected loci to further assess feature density and integrity. Trenches were stripped to the base of the topsoil/overburden with a small backhoe fitted with a 60-cm-wide, smooth bucket to identify any features in the undisturbed strata




Figure 21. Prince Henry Avenue lot, site plan.

Figure 22. Prince Henry Avenue lot, view north toward Bank Street.

beneath the upper overburden. Representative features were bisected, sampled, and recorded in profile on standardized forms and supplemented with scaled drawings and photographs.



STRATIGRAPHY

Stratigraphy varied slightly across the study area, primarily in the upper strata of soils, suggesting a moderate degree of subsurface disturbance from limited plowing or landscaping during the historic period. This assessment was confirmed by a local informant who, as a child in the 1960s, remembered the northern half of the study area being regularly tilled. A typical profile consists of three strata of soil as illustrated on the profile of Shovel Test 13 (Figure 23 and 24). Typically, the soils on the surface consist of brown (10YR5/3) fine sandy loam (Stratum I) that extends to a depth of 20 cm below ground surface. This Stratum I represents a recent plowzone. Stratum II consists of very pale brown (2.5Y7/3) fine sandy loam that extends to an average depth of 35 cm below ground surface. The depth of Stratum II varied slightly, with somewhat deeper Stratum II deposits noted across the northern half of the study area. Stratum II represents a plowzone that is significantly older than that of Stratum I. Beneath Stratum II is yellowish brown (10YR5/6) sandy clay loam (Stratum III). During the testing period the ground was exceptionally dry, making documentation of soil color difficult. In addition, due to the demolition of a past residence, layers of compact clay fill were identified in the profiles of shovel tests and test units excavated across the south-central portion of the study area. As a result, evaluation efforts focused on areas that had not been affected by this recent disturbance.


SITE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE

Twenty-five shovel tests were excavated in a systematic grid pattern on the Prince Henry Avenue lot. All of the shovel tests were positive, yielding a total of 1,501 artifacts. Artifact distribution maps created with Surfer software indicate areas of high artifact density and point to general areas of activity during periods ranging from prehistory to the present.

The highest concentration of prehistoric artifacts is located in the central and southeastern portions of the lot (Figures 25). While prehistoric ceramics are focused in the central portion of the lot, lithic debitage and debris is focused at the southeastern corner. This may represent specific activity areas such as an area for tool manufacture and resharpening and an area more closely related to domestic activities, represented by the ceramics.

Artifacts from the historic period were assigned to one of three subgroups: Colonial–Federal (1600s–1830), Antebellum–Reconstruction (1830–1900), and modern (1900–present). These groupings were chosen to most effectively isolate artifacts of the site’s prominent Civil War occupation. More general groupings by century would have muddled the interpretation of Civil War artifact distributions.

Colonial–Federal artifacts are relatively sparse and concentrated in the west-central portion of the lot (Figure 26). The somewhat diffuse distribution of



- I - Brown (10YR5/3) fine sandy loam (recent plowzone)
- II - Very pale brown (2.5Y7/3) fine sandy loam (older plowzone)
- III - Yellowish brown (10YR5/6) sandy clay loam

Figure 23. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Shovel Test 13, profile.

these artifacts reflects a light to moderate domestic occupation of the site prior to 1830. This occupation may be associated with a tavern that was located at the corner of Maplewood and Prince Henry avenues during the late colonial and possibly Federal periods; the lot occupied by the tavern extended as far southeast as present Bank Street.

Antebellum–Reconstruction artifacts are most heavily concentrated on the western half of the lot (Figure 27). A concentration in the southeastern corner no doubt is related to the house that once stood there. Another concentration of nineteenth-century artifacts in the southwestern corner reflects another recently demolished dwelling that stood on this portion of the lot. The high concentrations of nineteenth-century artifacts in the northern two-thirds and western half of the lot most likely represents Civil War activities associated with Feature 8 (see below). An 1865 map of City Point (see Figures 15 and 16) indicates that several structures or shelters were located along the western edge of the property. The artifact distribution shown in Figure 27 reflects this occupation.

The highest concentration of modern artifacts occurs in the southwestern corner of the lot, where a recently demolished house once stood. Besides this localized concentration, modern artifacts are scat-



Figure 24. Typical shovel test.

tered across the entire lot. Domestic occupation of the two structures along with their demolition probably accounts for most of these artifacts.

In summary, relative densities of artifacts with different date ranges indicate how the site was used over time. In the case of the Prince Henry Avenue study area, recovered artifacts point to human occupation spanning thousands of years. While the nineteenth-century and modern occupation of this lot was intense, the prehistoric and Colonial–Federal presence also are represented. Though the intensity of the prehistoric occupation is uncertain, the site was occupied for an extensive period prior to European contact. The Colonial–Federal period occupation is rather diffuse as indicated by the artifact density map. However, one must bear in mind that during this period household goods and non-perishable items were present in much lower quantities than the more recent historic periods. While diffuse, the Colonial–Federal artifacts may represent a domestic occupation.




Figure 25. Prince Henry Avenue lot, distribution of prehistoric artifacts from shovel tests.




Figure 26. Prince Henry Avenue lot, distribution of Colonial-Federal period artifacts from shovel tests.




Figure 27. Prince Henry Avenue lot, distribution of Antebellum-Reconstruction period artifacts from shovel tests.

TEST UNIT EXCAVATION

Seven 1-x-1-m test units were excavated at the Prince Henry Avenue study area (see Figure 21). These test units were excavated in areas with high potential for locating features and/or cultural deposits as determined by shovel test results and artifact density maps.

Test Unit 1

Test Unit 1 was placed at coordinates 540N 470E, adjacent to Shovel Test 14 which had yielded a colonial tobacco pipe fragment (see Figure 21). Stratum I consists of a grayish brown (10YR5/2) fine silty loam plowzone that extends 15–20 cm below the ground surface and contained 598 historic and 32 prehistoric artifacts (Figure 28). Stratum II consists of grayish brown (10YR5/2) fine silty loam mottled with brown (10YR5/3) fine silty loam and yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam that extends to approximately 25 cm below the ground surface. Recovered artifacts include 225 historic and 61 prehistoric artifacts. Stratum III consists of light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty loam mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/6) silty clay loam that extends to 40 cm below the ground surface. A significant decrease in overall artifact density was observed in Stratum III, with only 22 historic and 39 prehistoric artifacts recovered.

Artifact distribution by depth suggests that Stratum I represents a plowzone. The mixed composition of the Stratum II artifact assemblage suggests that like Stratum I, Stratum II also represents a plowzone. The fact that a larger proportion of the Stratum II artifact assemblage is prehistoric in origin suggests Stratum II is indeed older than Stratum I, untouched by the more recent agricultural plowing represented in Stratum I.

Two features (Features 1 and 2) were identified at the base of Stratum III (Figure 29; see discussion of features below).


Test Unit 2

Test Unit 2 was placed at coordinates 530N 480E to investigate a concentration of animal bone found in Shovel Test 12 (see Figure 21). Stratum I con-

sists of pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam that extends 10–15 cm below the ground surface (see Figure 30). Recovered artifacts include 165 historic and 14 prehistoric artifacts. Stratum II consists of brown (10YR5/3) silty loam mottled with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty loam that extends to approximately 35–40 cm below the ground surface. Artifacts include 719 historic and 37 prehistoric artifacts. The increase in both historic and prehistoric artifact density in Stratum II is in contrast to patterns observed elsewhere across the lot. The mixed nature of the Stratum II artifact assemblage suggests that Stratum II represents the older plowzone that underlies Stratum I. Stratum III consists of very pale brown (10YR7/4) silty loam mottled with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty loam that extends to 45 cm below the ground surface. Artifacts recovered from Stratum III include 25 historic and 11 prehistoric artifacts, reflecting a similar decrease in overall artifact density observed elsewhere in Stratum III across the lot. No cultural features were observed at the base of excavation.


Test Unit 3

Test Unit 3 was placed at coordinates 520N 479E, near the center of the lot adjacent to Shovel Test 11, to further evaluate a large subsurface concentration of handmade brick and other architectural debris (see Figure 20). Stratum I consists of grayish brown (10YR5/2) silty loam plowzone that extends 15–20 cm the ground below surface (Figure 31). Stratum I contained 422 historic and nine prehistoric artifacts. This was the lowest total of prehistoric artifacts recovered from this stratum among all the test units. Stratum II consists of pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam that extends to approximately 35 cm below the ground surface. Artifacts recovered from Stratum II include 369 historic and 60 prehistoric artifacts, representing the largest increase in prehistoric artifact density in Stratum II across the site. Stratum III consists of pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam that extends to 40 cm below the ground surface. While Strata II and III have the same texture and Munsell hue, differences in artifact type and density and the presence of charcoal flecking in Stratum II indicate the two are distinct




- I - Grayish brown (10YR5/2) fine silty loam (plowzone)
- II - Grayish brown (10YR5/2) fine silty loam mottled with brown (10YR5/3) fine silty loam and yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam
- III - Light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty loam mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/6) silty clay loam
- IV - Strong brown (7.5YR5/8) clay lightly mottled with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty clay loam (subsoil)

Figure 28. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 1, west profile.




- Feature 1 - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam with small pockets of strong brown (7.5YR5/8) silty clay
- Feature 2 - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty clay loam mottled with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty clay loam and strong brown (7.5YR5/8) silty clay
- IV - Strong brown (7.5YR5/8) clay lightly mottled with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty clay loam (subsoil)

Figure 29. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 1, Features 1 and 2, plan.




- I - Pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam
- II - Brown (10YR3/5) silty loam mottled with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty loam
- III - Very pale brown (10YR7/4) silty loam mottled with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) silty loam
- Subsoil - Brownish yellow (10YR6/6) silty loam

Figure 30. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 2, west profile.



- I - Grayish brown (10YR5/2) silty loam mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/8) clay loam (plowzone)
- II - Pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam with charcoal flecking
- III - Pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam
- IV - Brownish yellow (10YR6/6) silty loam mottled with pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam (subsoil)

Figure 31. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 3, west and east profiles.



Feature 5 - Light yellowish brown (2.5Y6/8) silty loam mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/8) silty clay and pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam
 IV - Brownish yellow (10YR6/6) silty loam mottled with pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam (subsoil)

Figure 32. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 3, Feature 5, plan.

deposits. Artifacts from Stratum III include seven historic and 30 prehistoric artifacts, representing the largest decrease in historic artifact density from Stratum II to Stratum III among the test units. Distribution of artifact density and assemblage composition by depth suggest a stratigraphic sequence similar to that described for Test Unit 2.

One feature (Feature 5) was identified at the base of Stratum III (Figure 32; see discussion of features below).

Test Unit 4

Test Unit 4 was placed at coordinates 509N 499E near the southeast corner of the study area, adjacent to Shovel Test 2 which had yielded a large amount of prehistoric lithic debitage (see Figure 21). Stratum I consists of brown (10YR4/3) silty loam that extends 15–20 cm below the ground surface (Figure 33). Stratum I contained 229 historic and 32 prehistoric artifacts. Stratum II consists of yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam that extends to approximately 30 cm below the ground surface. Artifacts recovered from Stratum II include 36 historic and 34 prehistoric artifacts, representing the largest decrease in historic artifact density observed in Stratum II across the lot. Stratum III consists of


pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam that extends to 35–40 cm below the ground surface. No artifacts were recovered from Stratum III. The stratigraphic sequence of Test Unit 4 differs slightly from other test units. Most of the artifact assemblage seems con-

finned to Stratum I, representing a relatively recent historic plowzone. Stratum II likely represents older plowzone deposits not disturbed by more recent plowing activities, evident by the recovery of nearly equal densities of prehistoric and historic artifacts. The lack of artifacts from Stratum III suggests a lack of subplowzone activity across this portion of the lot. In essence, the archaeological deposits in Test Unit 4 likely represent material displaced and redeposited by historic-period plowing.

Two features (Features 3 and 4) were identified at the base of Stratum III (Figure 34; see discussion of features below).


Test Unit 5

Test Unit 5 was placed at coordinates 530N 460E in the west-central portion of the lot adjacent to Shovel Test 20 to evaluate a buried deposit or possible cultural feature identified in the shovel test (see Figure 21). Stratum I consists of dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) silty loam, interpreted as a plowzone, that extends to 15–30 cm below the ground surface (Figure 35). Stratum I contained a total of 563 historic and 54 prehistoric artifacts, a fairly typical representation of Stratum I assemblages across the lot. Features 6 and 7 were identified in



I - Brown (10YR4/3) silty loam
 II - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam
 III - Pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam
 Sidewalk trench - Very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) silty loam

Figure 33. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 4, north profile.



Feature 3 - Dark brown (10YR3/3) silty loam
 Feature 4 - Yellowish brown (10YR5/6) silty loam mottled with dark brown (10YR3/3) silty loam
 III - Pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam

Figure 34. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 4, Features 3 and 4, plan.

the southern half of the unit at the base of Stratum I (Figure 36; see discussion of features below). Both were recorded and photographed in plan but left unexcavated with the southern half of the unit.

Excavation of the northern half of Test Unit 5 continued into subplowzone deposits. Stratum II consists of dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) silty loam that extends to 40–45 cm below the ground surface. Recovered artifacts include 199 historic and 17 prehistoric artifacts. The decrease in both prehistoric and historic artifact density is also fairly representative of Stratum II assemblages across the lot. Stratum III consists of brown (10YR4/3) silty loam that extends to approximately 55 cm below the ground surface. A small assemblage of six historic and four prehistoric artifacts was recovered from Stratum III. These represent some of the lowest numbers of either artifact class recovered from Stratum III across the lot. Distribution of artifact density and assemblage composition by depth suggest a stratigraphic sequence similar to that observed elsewhere across the study area.

Test Unit 6

Test Unit 6 was placed at coordinates 510N 459E in the southwestern corner of the lot adjacent to Shovel Test 18, which had yielded a large number of nineteenth-century ceramic buttons and bottle glass (see Figure 21). Stratum I consists of a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) silty loam, identified as a plowzone, that extends 25–30 cm below the ground surface (Figure 37). Stratum I contained a total of 902 historic and four prehistoric artifacts. This by far represents the highest concentration of historic artifacts recovered from Stratum I. Stratum II consists of light yellowish brown (2.5Y6/4) silty loam that extends to 35–40 cm below the ground surface. Artifacts recovered from Stratum II include 174 historic and 16 prehistoric artifacts. From these totals, it is apparent that the bulk of the historic artifact assemblage is confined to Stratum I contexts. Two features (Features 12 and 13) were identified at the base of Stratum II (Figure 38; see discussion of features below). Stratum III consists of a light gray (2.5Y7/2) silty loam that was encountered at approximately 40 cm below the

ground surface. No artifacts were recovered from Stratum III. Artifact distribution and assemblage composition by depth suggest a stratigraphic sequence similar to that observed elsewhere across this lot, the only exception being a higher proportion of historic artifacts recovered from more recent plowzone (Stratum I).

Test Unit 7


Test Unit 7 was a 1-x-1-m unit with its southwest corner placed at 505N 495E (see Figure 21). The placement was chosen to evaluate the vertical and horizontal integrity of the Prince Henry Avenue lot. Stratum I consists of a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) silty loam plowzone that extends to 25–30 cm below surface. Stratum I contained 250 historic and 28 prehistoric artifacts. Stratum II consists of a light yellowish brown (2.5Y6/4) silty loam that extends to 35–40 cm below surface. Artifacts recovered from Stratum II include 73 historic and 45 prehistoric artifacts. One feature (Feature 14) was identified at the base of Stratum II in Test Unit 7 (Figure 39; see discussion of features below). Stratum III consists of a light gray (2.5Y7/2) silty loam that was encountered at approximately 40 cm below surface. No artifacts were recovered from Stratum III.

MECHANICAL STRIPPING


Two trenches were excavated on the Prince Henry Avenue lot, exposing a total of 30 features (Figures 40 and 41). The nature, extent, and temporal and cultural affiliation of most of these features are unknown. The goal of trench excavation was to determine if cultural features were present and, if so, determine the relative density of features. Trench excavation gave clear evidence that features are present on this lot. Furthermore, the sheer quantity of features present indicates that the site retains considerable vertical integrity despite the disturbances and long-term occupation of the lot.

Trench 1

Trench 1 was excavated to explore a large portion of the lot in the most efficient and economical man-




I - Dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) silty loam (plowzone)
 II - Dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) silty loam
 III - Brown (10YR4/3) silty loam
Figure 35. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 5, north profile.




Feature 6 - Brown (10YR4/3) silty loam
 Feature 7 - Dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) silty loam
 II - Dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) silty loam

Figure 36. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 5, Features 6 and 7, plan.




- I - Dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) silty loam (plowzone)
- II - Light yellowish brown (2.5Y6/4) silty loam lightly mottled with yellow (10YR7/6) silty clay
- III - Light gray (2.5Y7/2) silty loam mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/8) silty clay (subsoil)

Figure 37. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 6, east profile.



- Feature 12 - Brown (10YR5/3) silty loam with light charcoal flecking
- Feature 13 - Pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam mixed with yellow (10YR7/6) silty clay
- Possible part of Feature 13 - Brownish yellow (10YR6/8) silty clay mottled with pale brown (10YR6/3) silty loam and light gray (2.5Y7/2) silty loam
- III - Light gray (2.5Y7/2) silty loam mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/8) silty clay (subsoil)

Figure 38. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 6, Features 12 and 13, plan.



Feature 14 - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/8) silty loam, yellowish brown (10YR5/6) silty loam, and brownish yellow (10YR5/8) silty loam
 II - Light yellowish brown (2.5Y6/4) silty loam

Figure 39. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Test Unit 7, Feature 14, plan.

ner. The topsoil/overburden was removed gradually to the level where the majority of features were being encountered during test unit excavation. Trench 1 was approximately 1 m wide by 30 m long, extending from 504N to 534N and 483E to 485E. Trench 1 exposed a total of 15 features, some of which are combinations several possible features (Table 1; see Figure 40).

Trench 2

Trench 2 was placed roughly 5 m west of and perpendicular to Trench 1 in the north half of the study area. The goal was to explore a high concentration of artifacts revealed by shovel testing and a feature found in Shovel Test 21. Trench 2 was approximately 1 m wide by 22 m long and extended from 459E to 477E and 537N to 541N, slightly less than 90° relative to grid north. Trench 2 exposed a total of 10 features (see Table 1 and Figure 40).

FEATURES

A total of 40 cultural features were identified during this archaeological investigation (see Table 1). Test unit excavation revealed 10 of the features, while Trench 1 exposed 17 features, and Trench 2 uncovered an additional 13 features. The function of most

of the exposed features remains unclear. However, several of the excavated features yielded not only large amounts of artifacts but also information about the various uses of the Prince Henry Avenue study area over the past several centuries. The following summary of features is organized according to functional categories.

Postholes and Postmolds

Nineteen of the features uncovered probably represent postholes, postmolds, or combinations of the two feature types, including Features 1–5, 7, 9a, 9b, 10–17, 18a, 18b, and 20. Posthole features are recognizable from the soil backfilled into a hole that was dug for sinking structural post such as a fence post or a support post for a building. The backfill usually contrasts in texture and or color from the surrounding subsoil. A postmold represents soil modified by organic matter from a disintegrated wooden post. Although the age of most of these post features could not be identified without excavation, they are assumed to be associated with the historic occupation of the property. Two representative postholes/postmolds (Features 9a/9b and 18a/18b) were excavated to learn more about the function and age of such features on the site.

Feature 9 is a circular anomaly consisting of grayish brown (10YR4/2) fine sandy loam with brick flecking. At its surface, Feature 9 appeared as a single circular feature. The feature was redesignated 9a and 9b when excavation revealed a second smaller feature beneath the upper one (Figure 42). The upper Feature 9a served as a posthole, while the smaller




Figure 40. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Trenches 1 and 2, plan of exposed features.

FEATURE	TYPE	AGE	EXCAVATED?	DIMENSIONS (E-W × N-S)	DEPTH	LOCATION
1	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	20 × 30 cm	–	540.85N 470.10E (TU 1)
2	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	40 × 40 cm	–	540.40N 470.15E (TU 1)
3	Postmold?	Unknown	No	25 × 25 cm	–	509.80N 499.80E (TU 4)
4	Posthole?	Unknown	No	35 × 40 cm	–	509.80N 499.80E (TU 4)
5	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	20 × 25 cm	–	520N 479E (TU 3)
6	Utility trench?	Unknown	No	21 × 12 cm	–	530.25N 460.85E (TU 5)
7	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	6 × 9 cm	–	530.05N 460.95E (TU 5)
8*	Root cellar	Civil War	All of the exposed portion	2.5 × 1.0 m	50 cm	540.25N 460.50E (Tr. 2)
9a*	Posthole	Civil War?	S 1/2	40 × 40 cm	7 cm	540.25N 462.10E (Tr. 2)
9b	Postmold	Civil War?	S 1/2	25 × 10 cm	4 cm	540.25N 462.10E (Tr. 2)
10	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	25 × 15 cm	–	540.30N 462.65E (Tr. 2)
11	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	10 × 10 cm	–	539.80N 462.20E (Tr. 2)
12	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	?	90 × 17 cm	–	510.32N 459.40E (TU 6)
13	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	20 × 10 cm	–	510.78N 459.17E (TU 6)
14	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	40 × 70 cm	–	505.60N 495.70E (TU 7)
15	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	70 × 40 cm	–	540.30N 460.00E (Tr. 2)
16	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	50 × 40 cm	–	539.70N 465.90E (Tr. 2)
17	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	30 × 40 cm	–	539.80N 466.60E (Tr. 2)
18a	Posthole	Unknown	S 1/2	50 × 40 cm	5–12 cm	538.60N 470.10E (Tr. 2)
18b	Postmold	Unknown	All	20 × 20 cm	4 cm	538.60N 470.10E (Tr. 2)
19	Unidentified	Unknown	No	50 × 70 cm	–	537.70N 473.50E (Tr. 2)
20	Posthole/postmold?	Unknown	No	30 × 30 cm	–	537.70N 472.00E (Tr. 2)
21	Possible pit	Unknown	No	2.0 × 1.2 m	–	537.70N 473.50E (Tr. 2)
22*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	1.2 × 0.8 m	–	538.80N 484.40E (Tr. 1)
23	Unidentified	Unknown	No	50 × 50 cm	–	537.30N 484.40E (Tr. 1)
24	Unidentified	Unknown	No	80 × 80 cm	–	536.70N 484.50E (Tr. 1)
25*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	80 × 70 cm	–	533.70N 484.50E (Tr. 1)
26a	Root	N/A	No	20 × 20 cm	–	530.70N 484.00E (Tr. 1)
26b	Root	N/A	No	10 × 10 cm	–	530.65N 484.25E (Tr. 1)
26c	Root	N/A	No	15 × 10 cm	–	530.40N 484.25E (Tr. 1)
27	Unidentified	Unknown	No	30 × 30 cm	–	529.70N 484.20E (Tr. 1)
28*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	1.5 × 0.5 m	–	527.70N 484.40E (Tr. 1)
29*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	1.5 × 1.0 m	–	525.50N 484.20E (Tr. 1)
30*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	40 × 40 cm	–	524.80N 484.30E (Tr. 1)
31	Unidentified	Unknown	No	1.5 × 0.4 m	–	524.00N 484.00E (Tr. 1)
32*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	60 × 80 cm	–	522.70N 484.40E (Tr. 1)
33*	House cellar or crawspace	19th/20th c.	No	1.5 × 11 m	–	509.00N 484.00E (Tr. 1)
34*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	50 × 90 cm	–	503.00N 483.50E (Tr. 1)
35*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	70 × 90 cm	–	502.00N 484.00E (Tr. 1)
36*	Unidentified	Unknown	No	40 × 30 cm	–	501.40N 483.40E (Tr. 1)

* indicates that not all of feature's surface was exposed.

Table 1. Prince Henry Avenue, summary of identified features.



Figure 41. Prince Henry Avenue lot, backhoe removing topsoil/plowzone from trench.

Feature 9a beneath was the postmold. The southern half of the feature was excavated. Feature 9a is approximately 40 cm in diameter and consists of yellowish brown (10YR5/4) fine sandy loam mixed with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sandy loam and light to moderate charcoal flecking. Feature 9b consists of light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sandy loam mixed with yellowish brown (10YR5/4) fine sandy loam and yellowish brown (10YR6/6) sandy loam. The portion excavated suggests that the Feature 9b is about 25 cm square. Artifacts recovered from Feature 9a include two nail fragments and several pieces of mortar. Feature 9b yielded three cut nails. This posthole and postmold are most likely associated with the nineteenth century and possibly the Civil War occupation of City Point. Proximity to Feature 8, which dates to the same period, suggests that the two features are associated.

Feature 18 is a paired feature consisting of a posthole (18a) and a postmold (18b) (Figure 43). The rectangular posthole consists of strong brown (7.5YR5/6) sandy clay mixed with yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam with light charcoal flecking. The postmold consists of yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam with light charcoal flecking. The northern edge was not fully exposed by the trench. The exposed portion measures approximately 50 cm north-south × 40 cm east-west. The southern half of Feature 18a was excavated to a depth of approximately 7 cm below the base of Trench 2. Feature 18a contained a kaolin clay pipe stem that likely dates the colonial period. Complete excavation of the shallow Feature 18b yielded a small white

seed bead. The date of Feature 18a/18b is unclear. It may be associated with other features that have not been exposed.

Utility Trench


Feature 6 was encountered at the base of Stratum I of Test Unit 5. Feature 6 appears to be a small trench, possibly related to modern utility work. The exposed portion of the feature measures approximately 12 cm north-south × 21 cm east-west.

Unidentified Features and Roots

The function of 14 features exposed by trenching could not be even tentatively identified. These include **Feature 19** in Trench 2 and **Features 22–25, 27–32, and 34–36** in Trench 1. None of these features were excavated. Three other amorphous features were determined to be the remains of root activity. Although **Feature 26** was initially identified as a single feature, further examination distinguished three separate root features, designated 26a, 26b, and 26c. By definition, these features are non-cultural and were left unexcavated.


Cellar/Crawlspace

Feature 33 is a large amorphous feature uncovered in the south half of Trench 1. It most likely represents a cellar or crawlspace beneath the house that once stood on the southeast corner of the lot. This feature is represented by gray to brown (10YR5/1 to 5/4) silty loam with copious amounts of construction, domestic, and other household debris. Although the artifacts in this feature appear to be mostly modern, a few artifacts from earlier periods also were recovered. These earlier artifacts were most likely mixed into the feature during the destruction of the building. This feature was not excavated.



Feature 9 - Grayish brown (10YR4/2) fine sandy loam with brick flecking
 Feature 9a - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) fine sandy loam mixed with light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sandy loam and light to moderate charcoal flecking
 Feature 9b - Light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sandy loam mixed with yellowish brown (10YR5/4) fine sandy loam and yellowish brown (10YR6/6) sandy loam
 Subsoil - Pale yellow (10YR7/4) sandy loam mottled with yellowish brown (10YR6/6) fine sandy loam and yellowish brown (10YR5/4) fine sandy loam

Figure 42. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 9, plan and profile.



Feature 18a - Strong brown (7.5YR5/6) sandy clay mixed with yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam with light charcoal flecking
 Feature 18b - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) silty loam with light charcoal flecking

Figure 43. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 18, plan and profile.

Cellar/Trash Pit

Feature 8 was initially identified in Shovel Test 21. The profile of Shovel Test 21 revealed a 28-cm-thick plowzone of brown (10YR5/3) fine sandy loam (Stratum I) overlying very pale brown (2.5Y7/3) fine sandy loam (Stratum II). Feature 8, as identified within Stratum II, consisted of a mixture of Stratum I and II with mottles of yellowish brown (10YR5/6) silty clay loam and a unusually high concentration of artifacts. The shovel test continued for approximately 20 cm into Feature 8 before excavation was halted.

Feature 8 was exposed at the western end of Trench 2 after the mechanical removal of plowzone deposits (Figure 44). It was recognized in part by a distinctive clay lens, or cap, observed just below the stripped surface (Figures 45). The feature is rectangular and measures approximately 2.5 × 1.0 m. The clay lens consists of a strong brown (7.5YR5/8) clay mottled with a dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) fine silty loam (Figure 46). In addition to the clay lens, a dark charcoal and cinder-rich deposit was present, centrally located on the northern side of the feature. Within this deposit, several bricks were noted as well as charred wood and bone. The western half of Feature 8 was excavated in two levels. Its removal allowed for a more controlled excavation of the eastern half of the feature, where separate strata were identified (Figures 47–49). A total of 5,977 historic artifacts were recovered from the feature. Feature 8 most likely represents the cellar or storage area within a shelter utilized during the Union occupation of City Point.

Data accumulated through excavation of Feature 8 and analysis of the recovered artifacts makes several initial observations possible. First, Feature 8 represents a pit that was filled during two separate episodes. The Lower Fill consists of Strata III and IV and represents the earlier of the two filling episodes. The Upper Fill (Strata I, II, and IIa) represents the later filling of the feature.

During the war or soon afterward, efforts were made to clean up remnants of the military depot and encampment. The Lower Fill of Feature 8 most likely resulted from a first stage of tidying the area

near the feature. Highly organic soil indicates that recently discarded trash was dumped into the feature at this point. Other evidence of clearing the area of wartime camp debris includes military ration cans and large quantities of nails and animal bone. The Upper Fill of Feature 8 likely represents a “capping” event, when an effort was made to completely fill in the remaining depression. This Upper Fill consisted of a mixture of silty loam and clayey soil scraped or borrowed from the surrounding area and dumped on top of the initial, Lower Fill trash deposit. This Lower Fill consisted almost entirely of silty loam or fine silty loam.

Analysis of artifact density and type by fill layer further supports this stratigraphic scenario, with much denser concentrations of material recovered from the Lower versus Upper Fill episodes (Table 2). The assemblage from Upper Fill consists of 1,121 historic artifacts and 100 prehistoric artifacts, while the Lower Fill contained 4,854 historic artifacts and 80 prehistoric artifacts. This conforms to expectations if large amounts of domestic or architectural debris were deposited in a small pit and then covered over with nearby soil, especially considering the history of occupation at City Point, particularly on this property. Following this line of reasoning, the Upper Fill, or “capping” deposit, would contain a mixture of artifacts contemporaneous with but also more recent than the period in which the hole was capped.

The difference in the preservation of artifacts from upper and Lower Fill deposits also lends to our understanding of the stratigraphic sequence. This is most evident in the preservation and condition of faunal remains from Feature 8 (a detailed analysis of faunal remains is presented in Appendix B). Animal bones recovered from Upper Fill contexts are small and relatively friable compared to the largely intact and well-preserved animal bones and shell from Lower Fill contexts. This disparity in the integrity or preservation of faunal material suggests that the animal bones and shell recovered from these two contexts were disproportionately exposed to weathering and agricultural activities. In other words, faunal material from Upper Fill contexts does not exhibit the same level of preservation as those





Figure 44. Prince Henry Avenue lot, plan of Feature 8 and nearby features at west end of Trench 2.



Figure 45. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, surface, plan view.



- I - Brown (10YR5/3) fine silty loam with charcoal flecking and nails
- II - Light brownish gray (10YR6/2) very fine sandy loam with mottles of strong brown (7.5YR4/6) sandy clay with charcoal flecking and bone
- III - Brown fine silty loam with heavy concentrations of charcoal, iron, nails, bone, and clam shell
- IV - Grayish brown (10YR5/2) fine silty loam with charcoal flecking, bone, and nails

Figure 46. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, north profile shape, four cross sections, and east profile (note: Strata II and III in the north profile are the strata that surrounded Feature 8 rather than strata within the feature itself; this profile serves to illustrate the feature's shape on its long axis).



Figure 47. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, east profile view.



Figure 48. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, top of Lower Fill, west half. Note the large fragment of soup tureen on the right.



Figure 49. Prince Henry Avenue lot, Feature 8, top of Stratum III (Lower Fill), east half. Note large pieces of animal bone, shell, and brick.

from Lower Fill contexts because the Upper Fill assemblage was exposed to the elements for a longer time and were subjected to crushing or trampling.

Two preliminary interpretations can be derived from the characteristics of Feature 8, its associated artifact assemblage, and evidence from historical maps. The feature could represent a root cellar or a storage pit within a Civil War shelter associated with the Union occupation of City Point prior to and during the siege of Petersburg. On the other hand, Feature 8 may have served as a root cellar/storage area beneath a tavern, saloon, or sutler's store catering to the soldiers and civilian workers during the Union occupation.

During the Civil War it was typical for soldiers, when encamped for extended periods, to improve their Government Issued tents with various amenities (Jensen 2000). One of the more frequent improvements made to shelters was the incorporation of a dugout cellar, or pit, for storage. Most Civil War shelters were impermanent in nature and leave little if any archaeological evidence. However, because of the duration of the encampment at City Point and the "provisioning" nature of the troops stationed there, construction of this type of shelter would be more substantial. The general dimensions of Feature 8 suggest that this cellar or pit was most likely within a wall tent. Wall tents came in several sizes the smallest being about 8 × 8 ft. Feature 8 is approximately 3 × 8 ft. and would have fit nicely

within this type of tent. The wall tent was mainly used by officers. Lower ranking officers would share a wall tent with up to three other officers of similar rank. Higher ranking officers would normally occupy a single wall tent but often had two at their disposal (Jensen 2000:42). In cases where an officer had access to two wall tents, one served as a bedroom and the other as an office or for cooking and entertaining guests.

Because of the type and nature of the artifacts recovered from Feature 8, it is likely that this storage pit/cellar was within a tent utilized predominantly for food preparation, cooking, or dining. The floor of the excavated feature was uneven, with the western side of the feature being at least 20 cm deeper than the eastern side. This would suggest that the western side might have had board flooring, although no evidence of such an arrangement was exposed. It is also possible that the entire base of the feature had board flooring and that the western side was slightly deeper to provide more storage.

The second possibility—that Feature 8 represents a root cellar/storage area beneath a tavern, saloon, or sutler's store—is suggested by City Point's function as a supply depot. According to McBride et al. (2000), military depots and large encampments often had several sutlers, and an occasional tavern or saloon. Furthermore, the 1865 map points to the study area as a likely area for these types of

ARTIFACT CATEGORY	UPPER FILL	LOWER FILL	ARTIFACT CATEGORY	UPPER FILL	LOWER FILL
<i>KITCHEN GROUP</i>			<i>Furniture</i>		
Ceramic*			Lighting device		
Food Serving/consumption	7	7	Oil lamp chimney	14	10
Liquid Serving/consumption	4	16	<i>Arms</i>		
Indeterminate	44	49	Ammunition	3	5
Glass*			<i>Writing</i>		
Beverage Bottle	57	32	Slate Pencils		1
Indeterminate Table glass	13	50	Pen nib		1
Unidentifiable	58	60	<i>Architecture</i>		
Metal containers	28	388	Nails		
Faunal/Floral			Wire		4
Animal Bone	130	618	Cut	479	1735
Shell (in grams)			Cut fragments	158	1596
Oyster	27.4	237.7	Wrought	1	16
Clam	216.2	3570.2	Fragments	54	
<i>Medicinal/Hygiene</i>			Unidentified	4	
Unidentified		1	Miscellaneous	4	3
<i>Clothing</i>			Miscellaneous hardware		3
Fasteners		1	Screws		4
Buttons	3	15	Window Glass	28	184
Buckle		3	Construction Material		
<i>Personal</i>			Brick (in grams)	927.8	19283.4
Sewing		2	<i>General Activities</i>		
<i>Smoking</i>			Agriculture/Horticulture		
Pipe Stems	6	6	Flower pot	2	1
White Clay	4	2	Large stones		2
Reed	1		Horseshoe		1
Red		1	Rubber	90.3	3
			Scrap metal	19	31
			Coal/cinder (in grams)	101.1	45.3

Table 2. Prince Henry Avenue, summary of historic artifacts from Feature 8 by level and function.

structures. Even though the map does not clearly identify the structures in the vicinity of Feature 8 (perhaps labeled “Stor.” for storage or store), two rows of sutlers’ stores appear to the northeast of present Prince Henry Avenue (see Figure 15 inset).

Taverns, saloons, and sutlers’ stores are differentiated by the types and quality of the services provided and the social and economic classes they served. Taverns, for the most part, offered a variety of services such as lodging, food service, banquets, as well as activities associated with drinking alcoholic beverages, such as smoking and gaming. Somewhat lower on the socioeconomic scale, saloons often only served alcoholic drinks and a limited array of foods.

In contrast to these two groups of establishments, the sutlers’ store was associated with the lowest socioeconomic status. The sutlers’ store offered, at times, a large selection of goods and wares to the soldiers and civilian occupants of any given military encampment or depot. “As an independent operator, the sutler could provide a broader range of food and drink than was available elsewhere. These products included dried and fresh fruits and vegetables (especially onions and potatoes), canned fruit and vegetables...coffee and tea, beer, wine, and whiskey” (McBride et al. 2000:108). Given the composition of the Feature 8 Lower Fill artifact assemblage (e.g., tin cans, animal bones, bottles, etc.),

the interpretation of Feature 8 as a sutler's store seems plausible.

ARTIFACT DESCRIPTIONS

A very large artifact assemblage was recovered during the archaeological investigations at the Prince Henry Avenue lot. In all, 13,367 were recovered, including 12,561 historic artifacts and 806 prehistoric artifacts. These totals do not include artifacts that were quantified by weight (e.g., brick, shell, concrete, etc.) (see Appendix A).

Prehistoric Artifacts

As is typical of prehistoric assemblages, lithic debitage comprises the greatest portion (84%, n=673) (Table 3). Most of the debitage is quartzite, but quartz, unidentified chert, chalcedony, and rhyolite also occur. Related to general debitage were four core fragments of either quartzite or quartz. These debris are the byproduct of tool manufacture and maintenance. Fire-cracked rock is also relatively common, representing 10% of the total. Such heat-altered stone represents cooking/hearth-related activities.

Formal lithic tools are represented by hafted bifaces (i.e., projectile points) and one notched axe. One of the five hafted bifaces was recovered from spoil from the mechanical excavation of Trench 2.

It is diagnostic of the Late Archaic period and conforms to the Bare Island type (Dent 1995:179). The remaining four are from excavated contexts: one each from Stratum III of Test Unit 2, Stratum II of Test Unit 3, Stratum II of Test Unit 5, and the Upper Fill of Feature 8. Two of the four are diagnostic Late Archaic stemmed forms, conforming to the general Savannah River (Feature 8) and Piscataway (Test Unit 2) types. The third is diagnostic of Middle Woodland forms, conforming to the Rossville type (Test Unit 5) (Dent 1995:179, 237–240). The fourth is a nondiagnostic fragment. The notched axe fragment, made of quartzite, was recovered from Stratum II of Test Unit 4. Together, the lithic data suggests Late Archaic through Middle Woodland (ca. 3000 BC – AD 900) occupation of the lot.

Other, staged bifaces were recovered that usually represent unfinished formal tools (n=5). Two bifaces, one quartzite and one rhyolite, were recovered from Trench 1 spoil, and one quartzite biface was recovered from Trench 2 spoil. The other two (both quartzite) were recovered from the Lower Fill of Feature 8. One informal tool, a retouched quartz flake, was recovered from Stratum I of Test Unit 6.

Twelve ceramic sherds representing food storage and preparation activities were recovered from test unit and feature excavation and general surface collection of the lot. Eleven of the sherds are from excavated contexts, while one basal sherd fragment

ARTIFACT GROUP ARTIFACT CLASS	SHOVEL TESTS	TEST UNITS			FEATURE 8	
		I	II	III	UPPER FILL	LOWER FILL
<i>FLAKED STONE</i>						
Debitage	73	147	235	69	35	34
Hafted bifaces	0	0	2	1	1	0
Other bifaces	0	0	1	2	0	1
Other tools	0	1	1	0	0	0
Cores	1	2	1	0	0	0
<i>OTHER STONE</i>						
Ground stone	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire-cracked rock	5	17	25	8	7	4
<i>CERAMICS</i>						
Sherds	0	1	4	3	0	0
Pipe fragments	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3. Prince Henry Avenue, comparison of prehistoric artifact classes by context.

was recovered from surface collections. Three sherds with grit tempering and a simple-stamped surface treatment were recovered from Feature 8. Additional sherds of this type were recovered from Strata II and III of Test Unit 1, Strata II and III of Test Unit 2, and Stratum II of Test Unit 3. The combination of tempering agent and decorative treatment are diagnostic of the Gaston pottery tradition, which dates to the late Late Woodland and Protohistoric periods (ca. AD 1200–1600s) (Egloff 1989:45). Other varieties include one sherd with sand temper and a fabric-impressed surface from Test Unit 2, and one sherd with sand/grit temper and a fabric-impressed surface and one with grit tempering and no apparent surface treatment from Test Unit 5. The fabric-impressed surface treatment of the sherd from Test Unit 2 is very reminiscent of the Townsend pottery tradition of the Late Woodland period (AD 840–1590) (Gleach 1985:187–188). Tempers of grit and or a sand/grit combination are also more common in Late Woodland prehistoric ceramics (Dent 1995:244). Together, the lithic and ceramic data suggest two primary prehistoric occupations of the lot dating to the Late Archaic and Late Woodland/ protohistoric periods.

Historic Artifacts

The historic artifact assemblage reflects three general date ranges: Colonial–Federal (1607–1830), Antebellum–Reconstruction (1830–1900), and modern (1900–present) (Table 4). Colonial–Federal artifacts are relatively few in number, indicating that the property was not intensively occupied or utilized during that period. Diagnostics artifacts are primarily from the kitchen, architectural, and personal groups. Kitchen-related items consist primarily of ceramic wares and include a small number of refined earthenwares (creamware and pearlware), stonewares (black basalt and Rhenish blue and gray), and Chinese porcelain for formal food serving and presentation activities, tin-enamelled earthenware, English and miscellaneous coarse earthenwares, utilitarian stoneware and stoneware beverage bottles (English and American blue and gray) for food/drink cooking and storage activities. Architectural remains include numerous wrought

nails and wrought nail fragments and a small amount of window glass. Handmade brick also was recovered in significant quantities; however, its use extends well into the nineteenth century and therefore cannot be viewed as diagnostic of this time period alone.

Other artifacts reflect daily activities, chiefly tobacco pipes and dark green wine bottle glass. Nearly all of the tobacco pipes from this period are made of white kaolin clay, indicating an English origin. One pipe stem recovered from Test Unit 3 bears the stamped letters “McDOUGALL/GLASGOW” and likely dates to the first half of the eighteenth century based on the stem’s bore hole size. Broken tobacco pipes were easily replaced with English imports as well as locally made types, such as the rouletted red clay tobacco pipe bowl recovered from the Lower Fill of Feature 8 (Figure 50). Pharmaceutical glass and fragments of chamber pots (white saltglaze stoneware and creamware) also were recovered.

Antebellum–Reconstruction period artifacts reflect an intensive period of historic occupation, highlighted by a Civil War–era storage pit (Feature 8). In general, most of the artifacts belong to the three dominant groups of the previous period: kitchen, architectural, and personal. There is, however, several other artifact groups are also well represented, including agriculture/horticulture, clothing, writing, arms/military, and toys/leisure activities. Kitchen items again consist primarily of refined earthenwares (whiteware, ironstone, and yellowware), bone china, and other porcelains for formal food serving and presentation, and a variety of utilitarian stonewares (Albany slip, Bennington, and Bristol) for food cooking and storage. Kitchen glass items were apparently more important or at least more readily available to occupants of this lot during the 1830s through 1900. Serving items include formal tableware settings with pressed decoration and molded and faceted glass tumblers. Food storage glass is also more common. Colorless, molded bottle glass and jar glass were recovered. The rise in glass kitchen items in the assemblage may reflect technological advances in the mass-production of housewares during the last half of the nineteenth

PERIOD ARTIFACT TYPE	SHOVEL TESTS	TEST UNITS			FEATURE 8	
		STRATUM I	STRATUM II	STRATUM III	UPPER FILL	LOWER FILL
<i>COLONIAL–FEDERAL (1600s–1830)</i>						
Coarse Earthenware	3	2	2	1	1	1
Chinese Porcelain	0	4	8	0	0	0
Refined Earthenware	13	23	58	0	9	11
Stoneware	0	2	1	0	0	0
Bottle Glass	1	14	7	1	8	1
Window Glass	0	3	0	0	0	0
Nails	4	9	6	1	1	0
Tobacco Pipe, Import	2	12	18	1	5	5
Tobacco Pipe, Local	0	0	0	0	0	1
Subtotal	23	69	100	4	24	19
<i>ANTEBELLUM–RECONSTRUCTION (1830–1900)</i>						
Ironstone	0	8	4	0	0	0
Refined Earthenware	95	275	262	3	12	19
Stoneware	8	4	0	1	0	0
Bottle Glass	11	1	12	0	1	20
Metal Food Containers	0	0	0	0	0	106
Clothing	10	20	6	1	0	0
Personal	0	4	0	0	1	3
Military	0	0	3	0	0	3
Nails	48	109	141	2	129	346
Stable/Barn	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tobacco Pipe, Import	0	0	1	0	0	0
Tobacco Pipe, Reed	1	1	5	0	0	0
Writing	2	0	0	0	0	1
Subtotal	175	422	434	7	143	499
<i>MODERN (1900–PRESENT)</i>						
Coarse Earthenware	3	1	3	0	0	0
Porcelain	13	79	24	0	0	0
Refined Earthenware	7	2	9	0	0	0
Bottle Glass	478	858	177	10	3	0
Clothing	2	3	0	0	0	0
Personal	3	20	0	1	0	0
Brick	1631.7 g	1900.6 g	19.3 g	7.1 g	0	0
Nails	22	50	6	0	0	0
Window Glass	142	122	149	0	0	0
Subtotal						
<i>UNDATABLE ARCHITECTURAL MATERIALS</i>						
Brick	0	3176.2 g	2109.7 g	167 g	1.2 g	13633.4 g
Nails	0	182	21	0	4	0
Window Glass	1	208	42	2	14	39
Subtotal		1	390	63	2	18 39

Table 4. Prince Henry Avenue, comparison of diagnostic historic artifacts by period and context.



Figure 50. Prince Henry Avenue, tobacco pipe bowls (a - locally made early colonial type with rouletted decoration [F.8, Lower Fill]; b - unglazed reed type, 1800s [TU 2, L.II]; c - glazed reed type, 1800s [TU 7, L.I]).

century (Jones 1985). An example of the latter includes a *Lea & Perrins* condiment bottle from the Upper Fill of Feature 8, dated to pre-1880. A multitude of colored container and beverage glass, typically ultramarine, aqua, and manganese, reflect changing consumer tastes of the post-1830 consumer market and the refinement of manufacturing techniques.

Architectural remains are largely concentrated in Feature 8, suggesting a substantial structure nearby. The bulk of historic construction debris and hardware from Feature 8 includes several fragments of window glass, a variety of wrought, cut, and wire nails, and handmade brick. Outside of Feature 8, the primary concentrations of brick, nails, and window glass mirror the former locations of house sites across the central (Test Units 1 and 3) and southwestern (Test Unit 6) portions of the study area. Closely related to architectural items are remnants of furniture hardware and accessories that became common following the Civil War. Numerous pieces of oil lamp chimney glass and decorative porcelain and copper furnishings were recovered from these same general areas. Lamp glass became increasingly commonplace in the household following the development of kerosene as a clean burning, nearly odorless fuel after the Civil War (Cleland 1983:7).

Military paraphernalia is limited to ammunition, buttons/uniform insignia, and metal tablewares and food containers (Figures 51 and 52). Metal kitchenwares, while also present in domestic settings during the nineteenth century, more commonly reflect Civil War food ration can remnants and accouterments. This assessment is strengthened by their isolation within Feature 8, a confirmed Civil War-era cultural feature. Ammunition consist of Confederate bullets such as .45-caliber Pickett and .56-caliber Sharp's and more generic types such as minié bullets from Feature 8 and one lead shot from Test Unit 5 (Thomas and Thomas 1996). Other arms/ammunition items include copper alloy percussion caps, cannon ball fragments, and one lead cleaning plug, all from Feature 8.

Most military buttons and other uniform insignia came from Feature 8. Diagnostics include one domed, General Service type dated to pre-1902, and one US Army General Service type dated to 1854–1902; both are made of copper alloy and have a molded eagle decoration. Two additional versions of this type were recovered from Test Units 5 and 7.

Other buttons were made of such varied materials as bone, copper alloy, ferrous material, composite copper/ferrous material, porcelain, and vulcanized rubber. They are concentrated in Feature 8 and Test

Units 2, 3, and 6 (see Figure 52). Several of the porcelain buttons are of nearly identical dimensions. Their uniformity and contemporaneous recovery with vulcanized rubber buttons, indicate manufacture by mass-production during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Personal items and other artifacts associated with daily activities are more plentiful compared to earlier periods, possibly reflecting the emergence of true leisure time by the end of the nineteenth century. A small number of broken reed clay pipes, common in the mid- to late nineteenth century, were recovered from across the lot, as were a seated Liberty dime (1875), several porcelain figurines and doll parts/pieces, and at least one possible gaming piece (Figure 53; see Figure 50). In addition, several coarse earthenware flower pots, two copper alloy sewing needles, and various writing implements (two slate pencil fragments, one piece of ink bottle glass, and one pencil nib) also were recovered. Together, this assortment of personal items reflect a greater amount of attention paid to personal appearance and leisure.

Twentieth-century/modern artifacts are fewer in number, suggesting a general decline in occupation intensity that largely mirrors the general history of the area following the Civil War. For the most part, modern artifacts cluster in the northwest corner (Test Unit 1 and Shovel Tests 14 and 21), center (Test Units 2 and 3), and southwest corner (Test Unit 6) of the study area. Information from local residents and city officials tell of a large nineteenth-century house that once existed near the center of the lot, corresponding to the approximate location of Test Units of 2 and 3. City officials also reported that the lot was re-landscaped and leveled following removal of the house by the City of Hopewell in the early 1990s. If the house was oriented toward Prince Henry Avenue as the location of the ornamental shrubs suggest, then the western two concentrations may represent material moved around the back yard during the destruction and removal of the house and subsequent landscaping of the lot. Furthermore, the presence of a second former domestic structure immediately to the west of Test Unit 6 may also

have contributed to the buildup of modern debris in the southwestern corner of the study area.

Architectural items such as concrete, asphalt siding material, and wire nails were the most common artifacts of this period. Their wide dispersal is consistent with having been moved around by post-occupational activities. Various types of late twentieth-century beverage and storage/container glass was also recovered from across the lot and is typical of casual or intentional discard. These include numerous pieces of modern beer bottle glass, *Coca Cola* bottle glass, *Vaseline* jar glass, and colorless bottle glass with an applied color label (post-1934), machine-made colorless bottle glass (post-1969), and currency (1940, 1943, 1949, and 1965 Lincoln pennies and one 1941 Mercury dime). Other diagnostic items reflect twentieth-century advances in standards of living, such as electric lighting (light bulb glass), recorded music players (phonograph fragments), and personal hygiene (plastic comb fragments).

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

In summary, large and diverse groups of Late Archaic, Late Woodland/protohistoric, and Antebellum–Reconstruction era artifacts indicate when the lot was most intensively occupied. The prehistoric occupations generally correspond with local/regional models of increased settlement during those periods in the Fall line transition zone near the confluence of the Appomattox and James rivers, areas with fertile soils and rich ecosystems (Egloff 1989; Stuck et al. 1997).

The primary historic occupation of the lot corresponds to the decades leading up to and following the Civil War, a time frame supported by documentary and cartographic research. Smaller and less diverse groups of artifacts were recovered from earlier and later periods, reflecting times when the lot was not as intensively used. Colonial–Federal artifacts clearly indicate a moderate domestic presence at this lot, possibly associated with a tavern north of the study area at the corner of Maplewood and Prince Henry avenues.



Figure 51. Prince Henry Avenue, military artifacts (a - brass grommet [F.8, L.II E½]; b - .45 caliber picket or sharpshooter's bullet [F.8, L.I E½]; c - whittled bullet [F.8, Lower Fill]; d - .56 caliber Sharps bullet [F.8, Lower Fill]; e - shot [TU 5, L.II]; f - cleaning bullet plug [F.8, L.III E½]; g - percussion cap [F.8, L.II, E½]).



Figure 52. Prince Henry Avenue, buttons (a-b - General Service, Union forces [a - TU 5, L.II; b - TU 7, L.II]; c - possible military [TU 3, L.II]; d - corroded ferrous; e-f - porcelain [d-f - F.8, L.III, E½]).



Figure 53. Prince Henry Avenue, personal artifacts (a - clay marbles [TU 4, L.I]; b - slate pencil [F.8, Lower Fill]; c - dime, 1941 [Tr.2 spoil]; d - penny, 1940 [TU 1, L.I]).

4: Pierce Street Lots

The second study area consists of three lots along Pierce Street near its intersection with Spruance Street. The lots are located on a relatively flat terrace that overlooks the James River (Figure 54; see Figure 1). The larger central lot is bounded on the north by Pierce Street, on the east by a gravel roadway, on the south by private residences, and on the west by Spruance Street. East of this central lot is a small grassy lot situated between the gravel roadway and the terrace edge. It too is bounded to the north by Pierce Street and abuts thick vegetation and a slope to the south. West of the central lot is a small, manicured lawn bounded to the west and south by residential properties. Together, these lots extend about 80 m north-south \times 115 m east-west, encompassing approximately 9,200 m² or 0.9 ha (2.3 acres).

A slight rise or knoll was noted on the west-central half of the large, central lot. Other surface features include a substantial berm or push-pile approximately 1.5 m high and 5 m in diameter located 1 m east of Shovel Test 26. A telephone pole (designation 312 B) is situated at the northern base of this push-pile. An old water pump (bearing the date 1916) is located next to a nearby tree stump, some 5 m northeast of Shovel Test 24. A fire hydrant is also located in the same area, 1–2 m southeast of Shovel Test 32. A rectilinear pattern of dead grass 50 cm wide was identified northwest of these surface features across the east-central portion of the lot. The visible extent measures approximately 15 m north-south \times 8.75 m east-west and appears to represent a subsurface foundation. Surface features were also noted on the western lot. Two small depressions measuring approximately 1 m in diameter are located 5 m east of Shovel Test 48 (see Figure 54).

METHODOLOGY

A grid was established across the Pierce Street lots, using a piece of iron rebar driven into the ground at the corner of Pierce and Spruance streets as the primary datum marker. A second permanent marker was placed approximately 50 cm east of the sidewalk some 10 m north of a chain link fence that marks the southern boundary of the city's property. This second point was established as 500N 500E. The grid is oriented such that grid north is 10° east of magnetic north.

A complete, systematic pedestrian survey of the study area was accomplished through both surface examination and shovel testing at measured intervals of 10 m. All soils were screened through quarter-inch wire mesh to ensure the adequate recovery of artifacts. Recovered artifacts were returned to the WMCAR laboratory for processing and inventory. Representative soil profiles were recorded for each shovel test and test unit. Changes in soil profiles and artifact density across the lot were recorded on a site plan as shovel testing progressed such that loci of anomalous stratigraphy or soils, or increased relative density of artifacts could be identified.

STRATIGRAPHY

Stratigraphy varied across the area, primarily in the upper strata, suggesting a moderate degree of subsurface disturbance from limited historic-period plowing or landscaping. Each segment of the study area exhibited slight differences in stratigraphy. East of Spruance Street, the typical profile consists of four soil strata (Figure 55). As the profile of Shovel Test 12 illustrates, the top stratum is a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) coarse sandy loam (Stratum I)





Figure 54. Pierce Street lot, plan showing shovel test locations and surface features.



Shovel Test 7

- I - Brown (10YR5/3) coarse sandy loam mottled with grayish brown (10YR5/2) clay, light gray (10YR7/8) clay, and strong brown (7.5YR5/8) clay
- II - Very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine sandy silty loam
- III - Very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine sandy silty loam mottled with dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) fine sand, brownish yellow (10YR6/6) sandy clay, and light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) fine sand

Shovel Test 11

- I - Dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) fine sandy loam
- II - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sandy loam mottled with yellowish brown (10YR5/8) sandy clay and light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) fine sand
- III - Dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) coarse sand
- IV - Yellowish brown (10YR5/6) medium fine sand
- V - Yellowish brown (10YR5/8) clayey sand

Shovel Test 12

- I - Dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) coarse sandy loam (topsoil/plowzone)
- II - Dark yellowish brown (10YR4/6) to yellowish brown (10YR5/6) coarse sandy loam
- III - Pale brown (10YR7/3) to light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sandy loam
- IV - Strong brown (7.5YR5/8) to yellowish brown (10YR5/8) clayey sand (subsoil)

Shovel Test 49

- I - Dark brown (10YR3/3) silty loam
- II - Yellowish brown (10YR5/6) sandy clay loam
- III - Brownish yellow (10YR6/8) sandy clay

Figure 55. Pierce Street lot, Shovel Tests 7, 11, 12, and 49, profiles.

that extends to 15–27 cm below the ground surface. This stratum likely represents mixed topsoil and plowzone deposits. Beneath this is dark yellowish brown (10YR4/6) to yellowish brown (10YR5/6) coarse sandy loam (Stratum II) that extends to 16–44 cm below the ground surface. Artifacts from this depth range consisted of prehistoric and historic items, a mixture common to plowzone contexts. Underlying Stratum II is a finer sandy loam ranging from pale brown (10YR7/3) to light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) in color (Stratum III). Stratum III extends to an average depth of 70–80 cm below ground surface, though there were occasional pockets of Stratum III that extended to 100 cm below the ground surface. Subsoil, a strong brown (7.5YR5/8) to yellowish brown (10YR5/8) clayey sand (Stratum IV), was identified at the base of Stratum III.

West of Spruance Street, deposits were shallower, consisting of only three strata (see Figure 54, Shovel Test 49). The typical profile consists of a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) to grayish brown (10YR5/2) silty/sandy loam that extends to 12–20 cm below the ground surface. This dark and organic-rich deposit likely represents mixed topsoil and plowzone deposits. Beneath this is a brownish yellow (10YR6/6) to yellowish brown (10YR5/6) sandy clay loam that extends to 30–40 cm below the ground surface. Subsoil, a brownish yellow (10YR6/8) clayey sand (Stratum III), was identified at the base of Stratum II. In addition, modern compact fill deposits were identified in Shovel Tests 41–43, located between the sidewalk and the western shoulder of Spruance Street. Throughout the period of the survey, exceptionally dry conditions hampered precise identification of soil colors.

SUBSURFACE ANOMALIES

Several subsurface anomalies representing possible cultural features and/or deposits were identified over the course of shovel test excavation. Large handmade brick fragments were exposed 50 cm below the ground surface midway into the excavation of Stratum III in Shovel Test 7, located along the northern edge of the large, central lot (see Figure 54). Excavation ceased and a detailed profile was drawn (see

Figure 55). The surrounding soil consists of very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine silty/sandy loam mottled with dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) fine sand, brownish yellow (10YR6/6) sandy clay, and light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) fine sand. The depth and highly mottled nature of Stratum III suggest that they represent buried historic fill deposits. The only diagnostic artifact recovered from Stratum III was a single cut nail, most common in the nineteenth century.

Shovel Test 23 was excavated within the rectangular surface feature described above. A thick layer of mortar and concrete was identified approximately 32 cm below the ground surface, where excavation of the shovel test ceased. The surrounding soil consisted of yellowish brown (10YR5/8) coarse sand. Excavation of Shovel Tests 27 and 31, 10 and 20 m east along the same gridline, respectively, likewise yielded heavy concentrations of construction material debris at the same approximate depth. The recovery of whiteware, machine-made brick, concrete, wire and cut nails, asphalt siding material, solarized bottle glass, and porcelain electrical insulators from these shovel tests suggest a mid-nineteenth-through twentieth-century date for this deposit. Given the composition of this material, this rectangular surface feature may represent buried structural remnants of a substantial structure. To confirm this assumption, a distribution map of historic construction material was generated. Analysis of this map indicates a very substantial concentration of construction material in the same area. In addition, a tubular section of ferrous piping, probably a defunct utility line, was identified at the base (approximately 40–50 cm below the ground surface) of Shovel Tests 17 and 21 just 10 m to the northwest of this surface feature. Its close proximity to a potential subsurface structural feature strongly suggests the two are associated.

According to local historical information and a current real estate tax map, the City Point Grammar School stood on this property at least as early as 1917 when it was listed in a local directory (Hill Directory Co., Inc. 1917:62). A map of Du Pont neighborhoods made in 1918 appears to depict the outline of the school in the same location as the foundation remnants identified during the survey

(Du Pont 1918). Later the school was renamed the Patrick Copeland School. The date of the structure's demolition is unknown, but a new building for the Patrick Copeland School was opened on Appomattox Street in 1937. Construction materials and other artifacts recovered from shovel tests in the rectilinear area described above most likely are associated with this early twentieth-century school building. Earlier artifacts suggest an earlier occupation of the lot during the nineteenth century as well.

A buried prehistoric deposit (Stratum IV) was identified 41–100 cm below the ground surface in Shovel Tests 10, 11, 16 and 17 (see Figure 55). Recovered diagnostics include prehistoric ceramics with sand/grit temper and simple-stamped surfaces and sherds with sand temper and fabric-impressed surfaces.

SITE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE

A total of 49 systematic shovel tests were excavated across the Pierce Street lots, yielding a total of 475 historic artifacts, 246 prehistoric artifacts, 1817.9 g of historic construction debris, 373 g of miscellaneous material, and 21.3 g of oyster shell. The spatial distribution of artifact density suggests that prehistoric and historic occupations are concentrated in mutually exclusive loci across the study area (Figure 56). The majority of prehistoric artifacts were isolated in Shovel Tests 28 (n=36), 32 (n=23), and 24 (n=22) in the southeastern corner of the large, central lot. Several minor concentrations were also identified. The most dispersed of these is centered over Shovel Tests 15 (n=18), 11 (n=13), 16 (n=11), (n=10), 1 (n=8), and 2 (n=10) across the south-central portion of the central lot, corresponding to a slight topographic rise. Two smaller, more spatially restricted loci are centered over Shovel Tests 9 (n=8) and 6 (n=7), to the north of the rise (see Appendix A). Outside of these loci, prehistoric artifact density was very light, with shovel test excavation yielding an average of two artifacts per shovel test. In general, prehistoric material is concentrated east of Spruance Street, with the heaviest concentrations occurring nearer the edge of the terrace overlooking the James River.

Prehistoric Artifacts

Prehistoric artifacts can be grouped into two primary artifact classes: lithics and ceramics. The spatial distribution of lithic material mirrors the overall distribution of the prehistoric assemblage (Figure 57). The same major and minor loci are reflected on both distribution maps, each illustrating the rather wide dispersal of prehistoric material east of Spruance Street. These individual loci likely represent individual activity areas associated with lithic tool maintenance and manufacture, the most intensive of which are located over Shovel Tests 24, 28, and 32. The spatial distribution of prehistoric ceramics deviates slightly from this pattern. As Figure 57 illustrates, two discrete concentrations of prehistoric ceramics are present. In general these loci correspond to the locations of Shovel Tests 9 and 11, on the slight topographic rise and previously identified during analysis of overall prehistoric and lithic material distributions. However, unlike these previous distributions, the distribution of prehistoric ceramics is much more restricted spatially, isolated on the western half of the central vacant lot east of Spruance Street. This information suggests that while activity areas associated with tool maintenance and manufacture (lithics) and food preparation and storage (ceramics) activities overlap to some degree, the most intensive example of each occurs across separate portions of the study area and signifies the functional separation of space by prehistoric occupants.

Historic Artifacts

The majority of historic artifacts were isolated in Shovel Tests 27 (n=52), 23 (n=34), 26 (n=28), and 28 (n=21) in the southeastern corner of the large, central lot (see Figures 54 and 56). Several minor concentrations or peaks were also identified, restricted to individual shovel tests across the study area. Some 20 m southwest of this main locus is a small peak centered over Shovel Test 13 (n=16), next to the chain link fence that separates the lot from the private residences to the south. Two peaks were identified over Shovel Tests 3 (n=29) and 5 (n=26), 30 m and 50 m northwest, respectively, of Shovel





Figure 56. Pierce Street lot, distribution of prehistoric and historic artifacts.





Figure 57. Pierce Street lot, distribution of prehistoric lithic and ceramic artifacts.

Test 13 adjacent to the sidewalk that faces the eastern shoulder of Spruance Street. Two additional peaks were identified over Shovel Tests 37 (n=18) and 35 (n=16), located in the eastern third of the study area. Apart from these loci, historic artifact density was light, with shovel test excavation yielding an average of six artifacts per shovel test. In general, historic material is widely dispersed across the entire study area, with the heaviest concentrations occurring nearer the edge of the terrace overlooking the James River.

Historic artifacts were grouped into three periods to measure how the study area was used over time. These are as follows: Colonial–Federal (1600s–1830), Antebellum–Reconstruction (1830–1900), and modern (1900–present). The density of Colonial–Federal period artifacts is very low and is reflected in the distribution analysis (Figure 58). Colonial–Federal artifacts are concentrated around Shovel Tests 32 and 35–37, in the portion of the study area nearest the terrace edge. Two additional smaller loci were identified in Shovel Tests 28 and 29, located 20 m northwest of Shovel Test 32, and Shovel Tests 1 and 25, located 40 m west of Shovel Test 32 adjacent to the sidewalk facing the eastern shoulder of Spruance Street. This information suggests that greater concentrations of Colonial–Federal period material may be found along the terrace edge south of this study area.

Antebellum–Reconstruction period artifacts are by far the most plentiful, suggesting the lot was most intensively utilized during this period. Three loci or concentrations were identified from study of the distribution information (see Figure 58). The primary locus is centered over Shovel Tests 27 and 36, located along the southeastern edges of the study area east of Shovel Test 12 and south of Shovel Test 29 (see Figures 54 and 58). This spot corresponds to the location of a possible structure that likely dates to this time period. This locus could therefore represent domestic debris directly associated with the structure. Two minor concentrations were identified northwest of this main locus. One is centered over Shovel Test 6, near the intersection of Pierce and Spruance streets. The second is centered over Shovel Test 44, on the small piece of city property west of Spruance Street and southwest of Shovel

Test 6. The isolated nature of the latter two loci suggests they represent peripheral or auxiliary domestic scatters associated with the substantial nineteenth-century domestic occupation identified in Shovel Tests 27 and 36. It is also possible that these isolated loci represent Civil War encampment scatters; however, without the recovery of artifacts diagnostic of the Civil War, such an assessment is quite tentative.

The distribution of twentieth-century/modern artifacts overlaps to a small degree the distribution of Antebellum–Reconstruction artifacts. The primary concentration is again centered over Shovel Test 27, with a minor concentration also identified over Shovel Test 44 (see Figures 54 and 58). The fact that these concentrations spatially correspond to substantial concentrations of Antebellum–Reconstruction artifacts implies a continuation of domestic activities in these areas well into the twentieth century. Modern artifact concentrations were also identified over Shovel Tests 7 and 29, both located near the southern shoulder of Pierce Street as it winds towards the waterfront section of City Point. It has been our experience that concentrations of modern debris identified near well-traveled roadways are likely the product of casual or incidental discard and do not reflect deliberate domestic refuse disposal.

ARTIFACT DESCRIPTIONS

A moderate artifact assemblage was recovered during the archaeological investigations at the Pierce Street Lot. As is typical of prehistoric assemblages, lithic debitage comprises the greatest portion of prehistoric material (88%, n=216). Most of the debitage is quartzite, but quartz and unidentified chert also occur. Related to general debitage is one quartz core fragment. This debris is the byproduct of tool manufacture and maintenance. Fire-cracked rock is also relatively common, representing 5% of the total. Such heat-altered stone represents cooking/hearth-related activities.

Formal lithic tools are represented by hafted bifaces (i.e., projectile points). Three hafted bifaces were recovered from shovel test excavation. All three are diagnostic of the Woodland stage (1100 BC – AD






Figure 58. Pierce Street lot, distribution of Colonial–Federal period, Antebellum–Reconstruction period, and Modern period artifacts.



Figure 59. Pierce Street, prehistoric artifacts and historic-period tobacco pipe stem (a - Yadkin Eared, metavolcanic hafted biface [ST 15]; b - Late Woodland Triangular, quartz hafted biface [ST 18]; c - Middle Woodland notched, quartzite [ST 33]; d - net-impressed, sand-tempered ceramic sherd [ST 11]; e - locally made ceramic pipe stem, colonial period [ST 32]).

1607), and two of the three exhibit morphological attributes characteristic of specific periods of the Woodland stage (Figure 59). A metavolcanic Yadkin eared hafted biface from Shovel Test 15 is diagnostic of the general Woodland stage. More time-specific varieties include a quartzite Late Woodland triangular point (AD 900–1607) from Shovel Test 18 and a quartzite Middle Woodland notched point (500 BC – AD 900) from Shovel Test 33 (Dent 1995). Other, staged bifaces were recovered that usually represent unfinished formal tools (n=2). Two bifaces, both quartzite, were recovered from Shovel Tests 14 and 15. These finds correspond to the dispersed lithic loci located on the slight topographic rise discussed earlier.

Nine ceramic sherds representing food storage and preparation activities were recovered from shovel test excavation. As alluded to earlier, prehistoric ceramics were restricted to the slight topographic rise and the area immediately surrounding it. All the recovered ceramic sherds exhibited sand or sand/

grit temper, with the exception of a small unidentifiable sherd recovered from Shovel Test 2. Surface treatment was visible on three sherds. One sherd with sand/grit temper and a simple-stamped surface and one sherd with sand temper and a net-impressed surface were recovered from Shovel Test 11 (see Figure 59). One sherd with sand/grit temper and a fabric-impressed surface was recovered from Shovel Test 18. The sand/grit tempering and simple-stamped surface treatment are largely diagnostic of the Late Woodland/

protohistoric period's Gaston pottery tradition, dating from ca. AD 1200 to 1600s (Egloff 1989:45). Fabric-impressed designs also are more common among pottery traditions of the Late Woodland period (Dent 1995). Together, this data suggests a general Woodland-stage prehistoric component, with the most intense occupation occurring during the Late Woodland period.

The historic artifact assemblage reflects three general periods: Colonial–Federal (1607–1830), Antebellum–Reconstruction (1830–1900), and modern (1900–present). Colonial–Federal period artifacts are sparse and likely represent a light domestic scatter. Diagnostics artifacts are limited to kitchen items and one personal item. Kitchen-related items consist exclusively of ceramic wares and include a small number of refined earthenwares (creamware and pearlware), English stoneware for formal food serving and presentation, and coarse earthenware for food/beverage cooking and storage. The single personal item is a red clay tobacco pipe stem fragment recovered from Shovel Test 32.

Antebellum–Reconstruction period artifacts reflect an intensive period of historic activity. In general, most of the artifacts are kitchen, architectural, or electrical/communication items. This assemblage represents a slightly more varied assemblage compared to the Colonial–Federal assemblage. Kitchen items consist exclusively of whiteware (food prepa-

ration and presentation) and two pieces of stoneware ale/seltzer water bottles sparsely scattered across the main central lot. Kitchen glass items, missing from earlier contexts, were apparently more important or at least more readily available to occupants of this lot during the 1830s through 1900. They include a variety of colored (aqua, blue, opaque white, and solarized) and colorless molded and machine-made container and beverage glass that reflect the changing consumer tastes of the post-1830 consumer market and refinement of manufacturing techniques (Jones 1985). Most of the glass is concentrated along the sidewalk that faces the eastern shoulder of Spruance Street. This is unexpected given the overall artifact density of period material near Shovel Test 27 and the location of the probable structure.

Architectural remains are largely concentrated in the area marked by the surface tracing and Shovel Tests 23, 27, 29, and 31. The bulk of historic construction debris consists of handmade and machine-made brick, mortar, nail fragments, plaster, stoneware drainage pipe, and window glass. Outside this core area, architectural debris is fairly dispersed, suggesting it may have been moved around the property after destruction of the structure. Closely related to architectural items are decorative porcelain furniture furnishings and a few pieces of oil lamp chimney glass that were largely isolated in this same area. Lamp glass became increasingly commonplace in the household following the development of kerosene as a clean-burning, nearly odorless fuel after the Civil War (Cleland 1983:7). In addition, two porcelain battery rod insulators and two porcelain fuses were also recovered from this same area. Items such as these were critical components for electric lighting and telegraph or telephone communication during the latter half of the nineteenth century and the twentieth century (Cleland 1983:22).

Nearly absent from this assemblage are personal and other items reflecting daily activities. Two marbles, one clay and one colored glass (orange), and one coarse earthenware flowerpot fragment are the only such items recovered. Only one of these, the colored marble, was recovered from the core area (Shovel Test 28). The clay marble (Shovel Test 3)

and the coarse earthenware flowerpot fragment (Shovel Test 19) were recovered west and northwest of this core area, respectively, near the modern roadways.

When viewed as a whole, the distribution of all domestic items (ceramic and glass included) is not consistent with typical domestic occupations. Profile information and distribution of architectural artifacts confirm the existence of a substantial structure in the southeastern quarter of the study area, most likely where the rectilinear surface outline is visible. Domestic structures of this size and duration are usually accompanied by a rather sizable and varied accumulation of trash nearby. For example, a total of 10 functional artifact categories were identified for the Prince Henry Avenue lot historic shovel test assemblage, with kitchen and architectural items accounting for 59% and 36% of total assemblage, respectively. Conversely, only six functional artifact categories were identified for the Pierce Street lot historic shovel test assemblage, with kitchen and architectural items accounting for nearly equal percentages of the assemblage, 46% and 42%, respectively.

Clearly the Pierce Street Antebellum–Reconstruction assemblage exhibits neither the variety nor density typical for domestic house sites. The problem then becomes how best to explain these conflicting sets of information. The best rationale for the lack of domestic debris is that this structure does not represent a domestic house site but instead, may represent a congregation or meeting place such as a church. Churches, while often of at least equal size to house sites in size, do not accumulate abundant or varied material debris because of the more restricted range of activities associated with them.

Twentieth-century/modern artifacts are fewer in number. For the most part, modern material is concentrated in the southeast (Shovel Test 27) and northwest (Shovel Test 44) corners of the study area. Architectural items such as concrete, asphalt siding material, and wire nails were the most common artifacts of this period. Their concentration in and around Shovel Test 27 is consistent with the location of a substantial structure that was occupied or used into the twentieth-century. There is surpris-

ingly little debris outside this core area, suggesting a rather limited occupation or usage during the twentieth-century. Various late twentieth-century beverage and storage/container glass was also recovered from across the lot and is typical of casual or intentional discard. These include numerous pieces of modern beer bottle glass, Coca Cola bottle glass, and colorless bottle glass with an applied color label (post-1934) found in shovel test excavation closest to Pierce and Spruance streets and the existing private homes. Other modern items include a pocketknife, a piece of plastic, and a phonograph fragment.

SUMMARY

In summary, groups of Late Woodland and Antebellum–Reconstruction era artifacts indicate the periods of most intensive use at Pierce Street. Distributional analysis of prehistoric lithic and ceramic artifacts suggest the possible existence of spatially discrete loci associated with tool maintenance/preparation and food preparation/storage activities. This pattern generally corresponds to local/regional models of prehistoric settlement for the Fall line transition zone near the confluence of the Appomattox rivers, including research conducted at the Prince Henry Avenue study area (Egloff 1989; Stuck et al. 1997). The primary historic occupation of the lot corresponds to the latter half of the nineteenth and the twentieth century. Smaller and less diverse groups of artifacts were recovered from earlier and later time periods, reflecting less intensive use. Colonial–Federal artifacts clearly indicate a very light domestic scatter across the southeastern limits of

this lot, following trends of colonial settlement which favored locations near large navigable waterways.

Background information gathered thus far suggests the possible existence of a nineteenth-century church on the small portion of city property west of Spruance Street and the early twentieth-century City Point Grammar School (later called Patrick Copeland School) east of Spruance Street on the large central lot. The public school was in operation at least as early as 1917 when it was listed in a city directory (Hill Directory Co., Inc. 1917). A map of the neighborhood made in 1918 also shows the school in approximately the same location as the foundation remnants found on the central lot (see Figure 20). The building may have been demolished sometime after 1937, when the school was relocated. The locations of both historic properties correspond to dense concentrations of nineteenth- and twentieth-century material. This information is consistent with the composition and distribution of the recovered artifact assemblage and the established date range for the primary historic occupation. The faint rectilinear pattern visible on the surface, therefore, likely outlines the buried foundation remnants of this school. The isolated pockets of nineteenth-century debris to the northwest of the school foundations are very near the former location of a nineteenth-century church and/or church cemetery, possibly associated with one of the African-American churches established at City Point following the Civil War. Further archaeological examination of the lot in conjunction with more detailed archival research would be necessary to confirm these interpretations.

5: Fort Park

The third study area investigated is a municipal park located on East Broadway Street (Figure 60 and 61). The rectangular park is bounded on all four sides by paved roadways: Fort Street to the north, Wilson Street to the south, East Broadway Street to the east, and Appomattox Street to the west. The majority of the study area is taken up by intact Union Civil War fortifications that encompass an area approximately 80 m north-south \times 110 m east-west. The fort is surrounded by stacked split-wood rail fencing, also known as “worm” fencing, that marks the outer edge of the fort’s defensive moat. Facilities at the park include a gazebo, historical markers, and picnic tables west of the fort along the Appomattox Street side of the park and two horseshoe pits just northeast of the fort near Fort Street. Most of the park’s open space is to the east of the fort and consists of a well-maintained stretch of lawn 80 m north-south \times 45 m east-west. This portion of the park is used by the community for outdoor sporting events and youth activities. Portions of the park west of the fort also consist of well-maintained lawn interspersed with large trees that provide shade for the gazebo and picnic areas. The entire lot measures 83 m north-south \times 161 m east-west, giving it an approximate area of 13,363 m² or 1.3 ha (3.3 acres).

METHODOLOGY

A grid was established across the Fort Park, using a piece of iron rebar driven into the ground at the corner of Appomattox and Fort streets as the primary datum marker. A second permanent marker was placed approximately 150 m grid west of the first piece of rebar approximately 2.75 meters from the corner of East Broadway and Fort streets. This second point was established as 500N 500E. The

grid is oriented such that grid north is 110° east of magnetic north.

The archaeological survey was accomplished by a complete, systematic pedestrian survey of the lot involving surface examination and shovel testing at measured intervals of 10 m, and the judgmental placement of shovel tests inside the grounds of the fort itself. All soils were screened through quarter-inch wire mesh to ensure the adequate recovery of artifacts. Recovered artifacts were returned to the WMCAR laboratory for processing and inventory. Representative soil profiles were recorded for each shovel test and test unit. Changes in soil profiles and artifact density across the lot were recorded on a site plan as shovel testing progressed such that loci of anomalous stratigraphy or soils, or increased relative density of artifacts could be identified.

STRATIGRAPHY

Stratigraphy varied across the area, primarily in the upper strata of soils, suggesting a moderate degree of subsurface disturbance from limited historic-period plowing or modern landscaping/filling. Shovel test profiles excavated outside the fort fenceline and adjacent to Appomattox Street typically consisted of three strata or layers of soil above subsoil, such as seen here in Shovel Test 17 (Figure 62). The top layer is a dark sandy loam 11–22 cm thick that likely represents a mixed topsoil/plowzone. Underneath is a slightly lighter deposit of coarse sand 13–22 cm thick that likely represents an older plowzone buried by recent subsurface activities. Beneath this is a thick layer (27–34 cm thick) of light very coarse sand. The bulk of prehistoric material was recovered from this layer, suggesting it represents a buried prehistoric deposit. Below this prehistoric deposit, at a depth of 59–70 cm below the ground





Figure 60. Fort Park, plan showing shovel test locations and surface features.



Figure 61. Fort Park, view to the west with earthworks in background.



Shovel Test 17

- I - Dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) fine sandy loam
- II - Dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) coarse sand
- III - Yellowish brown (10YR5/6) coarse sandy clay loam
- IV - Yellowish brown (10YR5/8) clayey sand

Shovel Test 48

- I - Dark brown (10YR3/3) coarse sandy loam
- II - Strong brown (7.5YR4/6) coarse sand
- III - Strong brown (7.5YR5/6) clayey sand

Shovel Test 85

- I - Dark brown (10YR3/3) fine sandy loam
- II - Pale brown (10YR7/3) sandy clay mottled with light gray (10YR7/2) fine sandy clay, yellowish brown (10YR5/8) clay, and brownish yellow (10YR6/8) sandy clay
- III - Dark yellowish brown (10YR3/4) coarse sandy loam
- IV - Strong brown (7.5YR4/6) coarse sand
- V - Strong brown (7.5YR5/6) clayey sand

Figure 62. Fort Park, Shovel Tests 17, 48, and 85, profiles.

surface, is a clayey sand to sandy clay that represents culturally sterile subsoil.

Shovel test profiles across the more open section of the lot facing East Broadway Street are slightly complex, typically consisting of only two layers above subsoil (see Figure 62). As the profile of Shovel Test 48 illustrates, the topsoil/plowzone deposit is considerably thicker, averaging 22–28 cm thick. Beneath this is a very thick buried prehistoric deposit ranging from 36 to 48 cm thick. The upper portion of this buried prehistoric deposit contains occasional historic items, suggesting minor intrusions from deeper historic-period plowing activities. Judgmental shovel test excavation within the fortification revealed soil profiles and artifact assemblages very similar to those recorded across the more open portion of the lot facing East Broadway Street. These results indicate that construction of the Union fortifications did not impact the stratigraphic integrity of the lot. Shovel tests excavated near the edges of the lot frequently exhibited signs of modern fill deposits from leveling or landscaping activities (see Figure 62). As the profile for Shovel Test 85 illustrates, these disturbances most often took the form of a thin layer of topsoil covering a mottled layer of compact clay mixed with topsoil which, in turn, covered older mixed topsoil/plowzone deposits. Prehistoric deposits beneath this mixed topsoil/plowzone deposit do not appear to have been disturbed by these activities.

SUBSURFACE ANOMALIES

Subsurface anomalies representing at least three possible prehistoric cultural features were identified over the course of shovel test excavation. An unusually high concentration of quartzite ($n=152$) and quartz ($n=13$) debitage was recovered from approximately 40–60 cm below the ground surface in Shovel Test 52. These items are the byproducts of tool manufacture/maintenance knapping activities. Such a large quantity of removal flakes is consistent with intensive lithic manufacturing or knapping activity areas. The lack of cores and bifaces from this context is indicative of late stage knapping activities, where lithic tools were completed and/or existing tools resharpened or retouched for further use (Stuck

et al. 1997:52–62). A relatively large amount of quartzite debitage, fire-cracked rock, and two quartzite biface fragments were recovered from Shovel Test 86, alongside Fort Street. A slightly more diverse assemblage was recovered from nearby Shovel Test 94, which included a core fragment and an informal pitted ground stone in addition to a biface and large amounts of debitage and fire-cracked rock. The recovery of diverse prehistoric artifact assemblages in association with high concentrations of debitage implies early-stage lithic activities, where the initial core fragments and large lithic blanks were worked into early-stage (Stage 2) bifaces. Early- and late-stage knapping activity areas were usually organized around a central surface hearth of concentrated fire-cracked rock (Stuck et al. 1997:60). Moderate amounts of fire-cracked rock recovered from these shovel tests suggest the existence of hearth features in the immediate vicinity.

SITE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE

A total of 99 systematic shovel tests were excavated across the Fort Park, yielding a total of 1,083 prehistoric artifacts, 718 prehistoric artifacts, 644.1 grams of historic construction debris, 21.8 grams of oyster shell, and 1.1 grams of miscellaneous material. The spatial distribution of artifact density suggests that, aside from a few instances, prehistoric and historic occupations are concentrated in separate parts of the study area (Figure 63). At least 15 concentrations of prehistoric material are scattered across the Fort Park study area. Categorization of these density concentrations by relative artifact quantity (30 or more and less than 30) helped resolve these tendencies into more meaningful patterns. Five of these 15 loci are represented by artifact counts of 30 or more (see Figure 63) and consist of three individual shovel tests and two clusters of two to three shovel tests each. The former include Shovel Test 2 ($n=55$), Shovel Test 99 ($n=48$), and Shovel Test 69 ($n=31$). The latter includes one cluster centered over Shovel Tests 52 ($n=162$) and 51 ($n=35$) and a second centered over Shovel Tests 94 ($n=68$), 86 ($n=52$), and 87 ($n=31$) (see Figure 60). The two clusters of shovel tests correspond to the locations of possible subsurface cultural features





Figure 63. Fort Park, distribution of prehistoric and historic artifacts.

described above. Shovel Test 99 is within the Union fortifications, Shovel Test 69 is just to the southwest of the fortification moat, and Shovel Test 2 is adjacent to the sidewalk that flanks Appomattox Street near its intersection with Fort Street.

The remaining 10 concentrations represent minor loci that are likewise focused over individual shovel test locations found across the entire lot. With a few exceptions, these smaller loci tend to be congregated along the northern, eastern, and western perimeters of the lot, typically 18 m or less from the paved roadways that constitute the lot. Outside of these loci, prehistoric artifact density was considerably lighter, with shovel test excavation yielding an average of five artifacts per shovel test. In general, prehistoric material is slightly more frequent across the more open sections of the lot west of the fort and southeast of the fort entrance, coinciding with the most dense artifact concentrations.

Prehistoric Artifacts

Prehistoric artifacts can be divided into two primary artifact classes: lithics and ceramics. The spatial distribution of lithic material mirrors the overall distribution of the prehistoric assemblage (Figures 64; see Figure 63). The same major and minor loci are reflected on both distribution maps, each illustrating the most concentrated dispersal across the more open sections of the lot west of the fort and southeast of the fort entrance. These individual loci likely represent individual activity areas associated with lithic tool maintenance and manufacture. The three most prominent are located in Shovel Tests 52 and 51, Shovel Tests 94, 86, and 87, and Shovel Test 99.

A substantial amount of variability was noted in the prehistoric lithic assemblage. In addition to quartz, rhyolite, and quartzite debitage, unidentified chert, Williamson chert, metavolcanic, and crystalline quartz debitage was recovered, albeit in rather small quantities. Distribution analyses of quartzite and quartz debitage were not mapped due to their overwhelming presence (98%). The distribution of the remaining lithic material revealed three major concentrations across the lot (see Figures 61 and 64). The largest is in Shovel Test 99, located inside

the fortification, and includes unidentified chert, rhyolite, and Williamson chert. A more dispersed concentration is located near the western edge of the lot at East Broadway Street in Shovel Tests 47 (unidentified chert), 51 (metavolcanic), 56 (unidentified chert), and 60 (rhyolite). A slightly smaller concentration is in Shovel Tests 86 (unidentified chert) and 94 (rhyolite). Isolated examples, meaning one piece of debitage each, were noted along the southernmost grid line (Shovel Test 83 [Williamson chert]), the southeastern corner of the lot (Shovel Test 2 [rhyolite]), and the northernmost gridline (Shovel Test 26 [rhyolite]). The three largest concentrations of unusual lithic material correspond to previously identified lithic concentrations that likely represent knapping activity areas. If these interpretations are correct, then it follows that the preponderance of quartz and quartzite debris are the byproducts of the on-site tool manufacture and retouch. The light presence of these other lithic resources suggests they are byproducts from the resharpening or retouching of tools produced off-site and carried here by the prehistoric occupants.

Tools, consisting of bifaces, hafted bifaces, informal tools, and one piece of ground stone, are concentrated across the southern portion of the lot in Shovel Tests 85 (1 biface), 86, (2 bifaces), 88 (1 utilized flake), and 94 (1 biface, 1 ground stone) (Figure 65). A second, smaller concentration is located in Shovel Tests 29 (1 informal tool) and 30 (1 hafted biface), located at the north-central edge of the lot. Additional isolated finds were recovered from Shovel Tests 17 (hafted biface), 19 (informal tool), 75 (biface), 76 (biface), and 98 (biface). This data seems to confirm the interpretation of the locus that includes Shovel Tests 86 and 94 as an early-stage knapping activity area. As Figure 64 illustrates, neither Shovel Test 29 nor 30 is located in an area of high artifact density. Considering the low density of associated prehistoric material in these shovel tests and their location at the northern margins of the lot, the tools in Shovel Tests 29 and 30 likely represent incidentally or casually discarded material. This information also holds true for the other proveniences as well, with the exception of Shovel Test 17. In addition to the hafted biface, 17 pieces of debitage and five pieces of fire-cracked rock were




Figure 64. Fort Park, distribution of prehistoric lithic artifacts and exotic lithic materials.





Figure 65. Fort Park, distribution of prehistoric tools and fire-cracked rock.

recovered from Shovel Test 17. The contents of Shovel Test 17 are suggestive of a small lithic activity area, probably associated with a single brief occupation of the lot.

The spatial distribution of fire-cracked rock indicates a localized concentration in Shovel Tests 94 (n=13), 86 (n=11), and 88 (n=4) with decreasing densities outside this core area (see Figure 65). A more loosely defined dispersal of fire-cracked rock, incorporating Shovel Tests 4–6 and 17 was identified to the east of the fort across the small picnic area facing Appomattox Street. Northwest of this dispersal is a minor isolated concentration of fire-cracked rock in Shovel Test 24 (n=6). Densities are much lighter and more isolated west of the fort, with no more than four pieces recovered from any single shovel test. Small, isolated pockets of two to three pieces of fire-cracked rock were identified parallel to the grid lines along the northern and western edges of the lot (Wilson and East Broadway streets) (see Figure 61). A slightly larger concentration was identified in Shovel Tests 56 (n=4) and 52 (n=2), corresponding to the location of the highest concentration of lithic material. The core concentration of fire-cracked rock in Shovel Tests 94, 86, and 88 may represent the dispersed remains of a hearth or dumped rocks used to heat water for cooking. A lack of recognizable charcoal inclusions or other signs of burned earth suggest the latter is more likely. The random distribution and smaller quantity of these other concentrations are more consistent with general postoccupational dispersal.

Historic Artifacts

The majority of historic artifacts were largely isolated in two clusters of two to three shovel tests each located across the west-central (Shovel Tests 51, 53, and 55) and southwestern (Shovel Tests 76 and 77) portions of the lot and four isolated shovel tests (Shovel Tests 8, 14, 81, and 99) mostly situated across the central and northeast portions of the site (see Figure 63). All of these clusters consist mainly of post-1930s colored and colorless machine-made soda and beer bottle glass, not surprising considering the use of the lot as a public park. Most of the modern debris concentrations are located near

recreational spots affiliated with the lot's use as a public park. For example, Shovel Tests 8 and 14 are located just to the east of concrete picnic tables near Appomattox Street. Likewise, Shovel Test 81 is located just to the south of a double set of horseshoe pits. The remainder of modern historic debris is associated with random discard common to residential/urban environments near well-traveled roadways and areas with frequent pedestrian traffic. High concentrations of modern bottle glass were recovered from the interior of the fortification as well, suggesting this area may also function as a convenient dump for modern debris. Outside these loci, historic artifact density was fairly light, with shovel test excavation yielding an average of five artifacts per shovel test. In general, historic material is more common around the picnic area east of the fortification and the margins facing the major paved roadways.

Typically, historic artifacts were initially divided into three general periods to examine how the study area was used over time. Due to the overwhelming presence of post-1930s debris, it was decided to simplify the distributional analysis of historic material by sorting out the material that predated the twentieth century (Figure 66). Pre-twentieth-century artifacts are concentrated in one primary cluster (Shovel Tests 46, 47, 49, 51, 56, 58, 57, and 60) located along the west-central portion of the lot, and two smaller clusters located in the southwest corner of the lot (Shovel Tests 71 and 77) and the northeast corner of the lot (Shovel Tests 7 and 8) (see Figure 66). The remainder of pre-twentieth-century material is limited to single, isolated shovel tests, mostly found in the southwest corner and along the entirety of the southern edge of the lot. The relatively low density both within the clusters (an average of two artifacts per shovel test) and outside of them (an average of one artifact per shovel test) is indicative of a light domestic scatter, probably associated with an occupation of relatively short duration. The primary cluster may be affiliated with a Civil War encampment, as suggested by the recovery of one military button and mid-nineteenth-century ceramic tableware (whiteware), cut nails, and window glass from shovel tests in this area.




Figure 66. Fort Park, distribution of historic artifacts predating 1900.

Outside of this core area, debris is much lighter and typical of redeposition from postoccupational plowing and other earth-moving activities.

ARTIFACT DESCRIPTIONS

A moderate to dense prehistoric artifact assemblage was recovered during the archaeological investigations at the Fort Park study area. As is typical of prehistoric assemblages, lithic debitage comprises the greatest portion of prehistoric material (87%, $n=840$). Most of the debitage is quartzite, but quartz, crystalline quartz, unidentified chert, rhyolite, metavolcanic stone, and Williamson chert also occur. Such lithic variety is generally more common for Archaic-stage occupations across Tidewater Virginia, though local resource availability often dictated the material of choice for tool making (Dent 1995). Related to general debitage are two quartz core fragments and two quartzite core fragments. This debris is the byproduct of tool manufacture and maintenance. Fire-cracked rock is also relatively

common, representing 12% of the total. Such heat-altered stone represents cooking/hearth-related activities.

Lithic tools are represented by hafted bifaces (i.e., projectile points), bifaces, informal tools, and one pitted ground stone (Figure 67). Two hafted bifaces were recovered from shovel tests, each diagnostic of widely separated prehistoric time periods. One is a quartzite Early Archaic type from Shovel Test 17 that conforms to the Kirk stemmed series (7500–7000 BC) (Dent 1995:157). The second is a smaller quartzite Middle Woodland variety from Shovel Test 30 that conforms to the Potts series (500 BC – AD 900) (Dent 1995). Other, staged bifaces were recovered that usually represent unfinished formal tools ($n=7$). Seven bifaces were recovered, including three quartzite Stage 3 biface fragments from Shovel Tests 76, 85, and 86, three quartzite Stage 2 biface fragments from Shovel Tests 86, 94, and 98, and one quartz Stage 2 biface fragment from Shovel Test 75. These finds largely correspond to the lithic activity area in the southeastern corner of the lot



Figure 67. Fort Park, hafted bifaces and bifaces, all quartzite (a - Kirk Stemmed hafted biface [ST 17]; b - Potts hafted biface [ST 30]; c - Stage 2 biface [ST 86]; d - Stage 3 biface [ST 86]).

interpreted as an early-stage knapping area. Informal tools, consisting of quartz, crystalline quartz, and quartzite debitage utilized “as is” for a variety of activities such as cutting, scraping, etc., were recovered from Shovel Tests 19, 29, and 88. One complete quartzite pitted ground stone was recovered from Shovel Test 94. This is characterized by small, cup-like depressions pecked into the surface during use. Current interpretations classify these items as anvils/hammers used in large flake removal (Stuck et al. 1997:50). The recovery of such a tool is consistent with early-stage knapping activities.

Three ceramic sherds representing food storage and preparation activities were recovered from shovel tests. Each represents an isolated find and, as such, are more likely representative of incidental discard rather than concentrated activity. Individual ceramic sherds from Shovel Tests 15 and 40 do not exhibit any recognizable tempering agent or surface treatment. The third, recovered from Shovel Test 99 within the fortification, exhibits shell tempering and a net-impressed surface. Net-impressed designs, when found in combination with shell tempering, are typically attributed to the Mockley pottery tradition of the Middle Woodland period, ca. AD 200–900 (Dent 1995:235–237; Gleach 1985:186). Taken together, the lithic and prehistoric ceramic

data suggests a primary Archaic-stage occupation with a secondary, light Middle Woodland period prehistoric occupation as well.

Due to the overwhelming presence of post-1930 era historic material, the Fort Park historic artifact assemblage was subdivided to reflect pre- and post-twentieth-century time periods. Pre-twentieth-century artifacts are sparse and likely represent evidence of a possible Civil War encampment. Diagnostics artifacts are limited to kitchen and architectural items and one military item. Kitchen-related items consist of a small number of refined earthenwares (pearlware and whiteware) for formal food serving and presentation and dark green and solarized/manganese bottle glass for beverage storage and consumption activities. Architectural items consist of wrought and cut nails, eighteenth-/nineteenth-century window pane glass, and a limited amount of handmade brick. The single military item is a copper alloy U.S. Army General Service button, ca. 1854–1902.

Aside from the presence of the military button, this small assemblage is indistinguishable from typical eighteenth- and nineteenth-century domestic assemblages. This fact has previously been documented in WMCAR studies of Civil War encampments from Charles City County, Gloucester

Point, and Winchester (Birkett et al. 2001; Harwood et al. 1999; Higgins et al. 1995; Jensen et al. 1999; Jones 1998; Nasca et al. 1998; Underwood and Beckett 2002). Despite the similarities in assemblage composition, the recovery of a button diagnostic of the Civil War within the primary concentration of mid-nineteenth-century ceramic tableware (whiteware), cut nails, and window glass, and in such close proximity to a documented Civil War fortification, all suggest this assemblage represents a military encampment.

Twentieth-century/modern artifacts are far greater in number, undoubtedly reflecting the lot's past and current use as a public recreational park for the City of Hopewell. For the most part, modern material is fairly scattered across the entire lot, though there are obvious concentrations along the edges of the lot paralleling the active roadways, west of the fort across the open area used by the city for recreational sports, and inside the fort itself. Most of this material consists of various types of late twentieth-century beverage and storage/container glass typical of casual or intentional discard, probably from family or group outings. These include numerous pieces of modern beer bottle glass, soda bottle glass (mostly Coca Cola), and colorless bottle glass. Architectural items such as machine-made brick and wire nails also were recovered, though their sparse and scattered nature imply secondary redeposition and are not representative of primary domestic activity. Other modern items include plastic fragments, plastic screw caps, tarpaper, linoleum, AstroTurf-like material, a flower pot fragment, a 1952 Lincoln penny, and a 12-gauge shotgun

shell—an eclectic mixture common to urban landscapes.

SUMMARY

In summary, large and diverse groups of Archaic and Reconstruction-era artifacts indicate when the lot was most intensively used. Distributional analysis of prehistoric lithic artifacts suggest the possible existence of at least four spatially discrete loci associated with tool production and maintenance activities, possibly in association with four separate occupational episodes. The sparse and scattered distribution of ceramic sherds suggests incidental use of the lot during the Woodland stage. This corresponds to local/regional models of Archaic-period prehistoric settlement for the Fall line transition zone near the confluence of the Appomattox rivers, including research conducted at the Prince Henry Avenue and Pierce Street lots (Egloff 1989; Stuck et al. 1997). However, unlike the latter two examples, there was greater use of the study area during the succeeding Woodland period. The primary historic use of the lot corresponds to the latter half of the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries, the period of the lot's use as a recreational park for the City of Hopewell. A small but diverse group of artifacts diagnostic of the mid- to late nineteenth century were also recovered, reflecting a small Civil War encampment located at the western edges of the lot. Further archaeological examination of the lot in conjunction with more detailed archival research would be necessary to confirm this interpretation.

6: Conclusions and Future Directions

SUMMARY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS

Three city-owned lots were archaeologically investigated. Each was subjected to survey-level investigation consisting of systematic, close-interval shovel testing. Shovel test results provide a good sense of the extent and character of below-ground evidence on each property. In all cases an impressive record of past human activity was documented spanning the prehistoric through modern eras. More intensive evaluation was carried out at the Prince Henry lot, consisting of hand-excavated test units and machine-assisted trenching. One large Civil War feature was excavated in the process that provides a fascinating view of military activity late in the war. The results establish that the archaeological evidence on each lot is supportive of a case for potential National Register of Historic Places eligibility.

Evidence from the city lots examined by this project is representative of many facets of City Point's human history, but it does not reveal everything. The archaeology on these three properties can most effectively address two periods of Native American activity, namely the Late Archaic (3000–1000 BC) and Late Woodland-Protohistoric (AD 1400–1610), and aspects of the historic era occupation during the early colonial period (1607–1650) and the early to mid-nineteenth century. In the latter span, there is good evidence from what might be called the City Point Village period of the 1830s and 1840s, and from the Civil War period.

The lots are not equivalent in their archaeological potential. Tables 5 and 6 provide a useful comparison of artifact categories and densities at the three lots. At the Prince Henry lot all of the noted periods can be readily addressed. Useful evidence

of each period has already been recovered here by virtue of the more extensive investigation that was carried out relative to the other two locations. Results from the other two lots are intriguing and mainly serve as a measure of their potential for further study. At Pierce Street the evidence recorded thus far is related primarily to the late prehistoric period, around the time of European contact, and to a limited extent the early colonial period itself. This lot also has potential to reveal additional evidence of military activity from the Civil War. At the Fort Street lot there is an opportunity to recover considerable information on the prehistoric, Late Archaic period along with more evidence from the Civil War. It remains to be seen, however, how much war-related evidence there might be and in what condition it survives.

The limitations presented by the archaeology of these properties can be overcome through a dedicated program of historical research, including collection of oral histories from local informants. Under the goal of achieving fairly comprehensive coverage of City Point's history, historical research of this sort will be crucial to expanding what we know of the African-American experience. The formative Du Pont era can also be effectively documented under the same strategy.

WHAT FEATURE 8 REVEALS

The Civil War is the only period we have addressed in any substantive way with the information at hand. Excavation of Feature 8 on the Prince Henry lot produced a staggering number of artifacts (5,977) and well-preserved food remains (826 pieces of animal bone). This pit feature probably served as underground storage within a shelter used during

the Union army's occupation of City Point. By analyzing this feature and its contents, we have gained a unique vantage point on army life at this key Civil War installation. Even though we have access to many written accounts of the Union occupation of City Point, archaeology, alongside archival information, allows us to explore aspects of soldiers' daily lives that are still unclear. This interpretive value of the feature underscores the tremendous potential of Civil War archaeological deposits present at City Point.

The significance of this feature is best understood by following the process of excavation alongside the story the feature tells of army life at City Point. The first chapter in the archaeological recovery is the last chapter of the "mini-history" of the feature. So we proceed backward in time as the archaeological layers are removed. Over the course of the last 140 years, the upper 6 to 12 inches of soil on this lot had been churned up, probably through gardening and farming. This disturbed upper layer of soil had little archaeological value other than telling us, through the presence of several Civil War-era artifacts, that we might find intact deposits from that era. Feature 8 first appeared when we used a backhoe to scrape away the disturbed, upper layer for a better look at the deposits below. A large, regular stain of darker soil contrasted with the surrounding subsoil.

Hoping this time capsule of soil would yield new insights about the Civil War, we excavated the upper portion of this large feature with eager anticipation. Soil from the upper few inches gave us some clues about why and when the last shovels of earth were heaved into this pit. The mixture of loam and clay contrasted with deeper deposits in the pit, indicating two different stages of filling. This "Upper Fill" deposit also contained a mixture of Civil War *and* later artifacts. Nearby residents may have decided to complete the haphazard filling of the pit that had taken place at the end of the war. Sometime in the late nineteenth century, they had moved dirt from elsewhere on the lot. In the process, they not only dumped in wartime debris but also deposited later artifacts.

The "Lower Fill" deposits exceeded our highest expectations for the value of this pit. Here we found a massive dumping episode that must have occurred at the very end of the war. Artifacts in this layer were in better condition and four times more plentiful than in the upper layer—most important they all indicated wartime debris that could tell us much about the military use of this area.

First of all, the types and relative quantities of artifacts suggested who might have been using the pit and for what purpose. Most striking in the list of artifacts in Table 2 (see Chapter 3 above) are the large numbers of cut nails and animal bone. It is

ARTIFACT GROUP ARTIFACT CLASS	PRINCE HENRY AVE.		PIERCE STREET		FORT PARK	
	N	AVG. PER ST	N	AVG. PER ST	N	AVG. PER ST
<i>FLAKED STONE</i>						
Debitage	73	2.92	218	4.45	938	9.47
Hafted bifaces	0	–	3	0.06	2	0.02
Other bifaces	0	–	2	0.04	7	0.07
Other tools	0	–	0	–	3	0.03
Cores	1	0.04	1	0.03	4	0.04
<i>OTHER STONE</i>						
Ground stone	0	–	0	–	1	0.01
Fire-cracked rock	5	0.20	12	0.24	122	1.23
<i>CERAMICS</i>						
Sherds	0	–	8	0.16	1	0.01
Pipe fragments	0	–	0	–	0	–

Total shovel tests excavated: Prince Henry Ave. = 25; Pierce Street = 49; Fort Park = 99

Table 5. Comparison of classes of prehistoric artifacts from shovel tests by study area.

PERIOD ARTIFACT TYPE	PRINCE HENRY AVE.		PIERCE STREET		FORT PARK	
	N	AVG. PER ST	N	AVG. PER ST	N	AVG. PER ST
<i>COLONIAL–FEDERAL (1600s–1830)</i>						
Coarse earthenware	3	0.12	1	0.02	0	–
Refined earthenware	13	0.52	10	0.20	2	0.02
Bottle glass	1	0.04	0	–	2	0.02
Nails	4	0.16	0	–	3	0.03
Tobacco pipes, imported	2	0.08	0	–	0	–
Tobacco pipes, local	0	–	1	0.02	0	–
Total*	23	0.92	12	0.24	7	0.07
<i>ANTEBELLUM–RECONSTRUCTION (1830–1900)</i>						
Refined earthenware	95	3.80	15	0.31	7	0.07
Stoneware	8	0.32	1	0.02	0	–
Bottle glass	11	0.44	0	–	0	–
Military	0	–	0	–	1	0.01
Clothing	10	0.40	0	–	0	–
Nails	48	1.92	17	0.35	8	0.08
Stable/barn	0	–	0	–	1	0.01
Tobacco pipe, reed	1	0.04	0	–	0	–
Window glass	1	0.04	0	–	0	–
Writing	2	0.08	0	–	0	–
Total*	176	7.04	33	0.67	17	0.17
<i>MODERN (1900–PRESENT)</i>						
Coarse earthenware	3	0.12	0	–	12	0.12
Porcelain	13	0.52	5	0.10	0	–
Refined earthenware	7	0.28	0	–	0	–
Bottle glass	478	19.12	186	3.80	519	5.24
Clothing	2	0.08	0	–	0	–
Personal	3	0.12	4	0.08	1	0.01
Brick	1631.7 g	65.3 g	547.4 g	11.17 g	134.8 g	1.36 g
Nails	22	0.88	17	0.35	16	0.16
Window glass	192	7.68	47	0.96	12	0.12
Total*						
<i>UNDATABLE ARCHITECTURAL MATERIALS</i>						
Window glass	0	–	0	–	2	0.04
Nails	20	0.80	3	0.06	11	0.11
Brick	641.6 g	25.7 g	161.5 g	3.30 g	160.9 g	1.63 g
Total	20	0.80	3	0.06	13	0.13

Total shovel tests excavated: Prince Henry = 25; Pierce = 49; Fort = 99

Note: Although dates for wrought nails and whiteware overlap more than one period, they were assigned to the period with which they are most commonly associated: wrought nails to Colonial–Federal and whiteware to Antebellum–Reconstruction.

* Period totals for counted items only.

Table 6. Comparison of diagnostic historic artifacts recovered from shovel tests by period and study area.

almost inconceivable that typical soldiers' or even officers' shelters would have generated this much debris. They may have used a few hundred nails in floors for their tents or more permanent shelters, but in this lower deposit we found more than 3,000 nails or fragments of the "cut" type used at the time of the war. The proportions of artifact types suggest that the area was used as some type of commercial enterprise catering to the troops. A detailed map of the Union encampment at City Point adds weight to this theory (see Figure 15). The location of Feature 8 corresponds with a row of small structures labeled "Stor." Also, a short distance to the north, we see several structures labeled "Sutlers." The army depended on these independent salesmen to supplement rations with food, drink, and other supplies (Figure 68). Based on the makeup of the artifact collection from Feature 8, a sutler might have used it to keep merchandise secure (such as the many nails and other items) and/or cool (meat, fresh fruit, and vegetables).

Analysis of animal bone by a zooarchaeologist provided some of the most important findings from the feature (also see Appendix B). The 826 pieces of bone recovered from the pit make up one of the largest collections of bone ever found on a Union army site. Bone identification tells us the soldiers mainly ate beef. A well-known raid by Confederate

soldiers on a cattle corral near City Point has suggested the importance beef played in the Union soldier's diet. Archaeology bears out this fact. Roughly 65% of the meat extrapolated from bone remains consisted of beef. According to the size and number of pig bones recovered, pork was also an important food source, mostly in the form of pickled pigs' feet.

The remarkably well-preserved bone also allowed the zooarchaeologist to identify cuts of meat the soldiers ate. As a long-term installation with excellent access to supplies, we suspected that City Point soldiers ate better than many of their comrades elsewhere. The bones indicate they fared *much* better. The six most expensive cuts of beef were represented in at least 87% of the butchered bone found in Feature 8. By comparison, only 55% of cattle bone from an officers' quarters in New Bern, North Carolina was from similar high-quality meat. Whether food remains from Feature 8 represent officers' or soldiers' meals or a combination, the men at City Point were exceptionally well fed.

With the remarkable findings from this one feature and precisely mapped indications of many more nearby (see Figure 15), we can truly rank the City Point neighborhood as one of the nation's premier Civil War archaeological sites. A vast collection of written documentation of the war at City Point fur-




Figure 68. Union troops in front of sutler's tent at Bealeton, Virginia (Library of Congress digital i.d. cwpb-03891).

ther enhances the informational value of these archaeological resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

The ultimate goal of this effort is to advance the objective of the City of Hopewell to enhance its visibility through tourism and historical interpretation. The most fruitful avenues to pursue in the near future would include the following:

1. Additional, problem-oriented archaeology that would include participation by members of the local community and special groups from elsewhere.
2. Enhancement of public dissemination via the website and other media. For instance, popular booklets may be prepared on a host of subjects taken from the results of historical and archaeological study, a video documentary may be considered, traveling exhibits can be prepared, and interpretive signage may be posted on or near the three lots.
3. Additional historical research, including an effort to engage current and former residents through oral history collection.
4. Pursue partnering opportunities with the National Park Service, The Historic Hopewell Foundation, and other sympathetic groups.

Specific archaeological recommendations are provided that take into account both the potential of individual lots and the more general objectives of the project.

1. *Prince Henry Avenue:* This property has a very rich and diverse archaeological record and potential for promising results through further archaeology. It is situated in the heart of the original City Point village and the sprawling Civil War installation. Additional archaeology at this location would be guaranteed to generate important information relevant to the Civil War period, especially if the area around Feature 8 was expanded. Large-area, hand excavation elsewhere on the lot is also likely to yield information about the earliest colonial occupation in the City Point vicinity, including the antecedent Indian habitation. Finally,

one corner of the lot shows considerable potential to tell more about the prehistoric Late Archaic period.

Recommended priorities for further work are to (1) expand the area around Feature 8 with a series of hand-excavated units and additional machine stripping to examine the Civil War activity area, and (2) to open several hand-excavated units to further evaluate the Indian and early English evidence dating from AD 1550–1650.

2. *Pierce Street:* The survey results from the Pierce Street property are very suggestive of informative, intact deposits. Expansion of the work at this lot can look at the late prehistoric-protolithic Native American occupation, traces observed of early English occupation, and anticipated evidence of Civil War activity.

Recommended priorities for further work are to (1) open a series of hand-excavated test units and (2) conduct limited machine-assisted stripping in selected areas. This strategy will allow more thorough evaluation of the site's potential as it did for the Prince Henry lot.

3. *Fort Street:* No immediate, additional work is recommended on this property. Survey results indicate that the most abundant evidence relates to the early prehistoric occupation of the area. Civil War-related features may exist but specific evidence is lacking at this point. Should interest exist in pursuing additional work here, a standard series of hand-excavated test units in selected locations is suggested.

Following the preliminary recommendations for historical interpretation presented in Appendix C, historical research should focus on nineteenth- and early twentieth-century social history. The history of City Point during that period can provide insights relevant to the historical development of the surrounding region. Venues for historical interpretation in Hopewell could address topics that are underrepresented in area museums, including nineteenth-century African-American history and the transition from plantation agriculture to a more industrial economy in the twentieth century. These historical topics are also relevant to some of the present-day concerns of Hopewell's citizens.

Such an approach also would complement the archaeological research program by focusing on subject matter that is less discernible in the archaeological record. Indeed, rich archival sources exist for this later period. Potential sources for African-American history include the Eppes family plantation records at the Virginia Historical Society, early newspapers and other local periodical literature, court and census records, and oral history research. Exploration of the dramatic changes in the early twentieth century can also rely on oral history. Interviews with local residents can help us understand City Point's transition from a small village to a diverse community that included large numbers of recent foreign immigrants as well as African-Americans joining the large industrial labor force at the Du Pont plants.

A program for future historical research priorities could proceed as follows:

1. Before conducting more comprehensive research in primary sources, there should be close consultation with organizations and individuals involved with previous local historical research, including the National Park Service (Petersburg National Battlefield), Historic Hopewell Foundation, academic researchers from local universities, and avocational historians.
2. Review previous research, examine primary sources, and draw on oral history to build a more comprehensive and up-to-date historical overview covering the key topics of interpretation mentioned above.
3. Design a detailed treatment plan for historical interpretation based on this research.
4. Conduct more intensive site-specific historical research appropriate to the level of future archaeological investigations by the WMCAR at City Point.

References Cited

- Blades, Brooke S.
1988 *An Archaeological Survey of Historic Occupation at City Point, Virginia*. Division of Archaeology, Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Bowman, Shearer Davis
1988 Conditional Unionism and Slavery in Virginia, 1860–1861. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 96:31–54.
- Calos, Mary M., Charlotte Easterling, and Ella Sue Rayburn
1993 *Old City Point and Hopewell: The First 370 Years*. The Donning Company Publishers, Virginia Beach.
- Cleland, Charles E.
1983 *A Computer Compatible System for the Categorization, Enumeration, and Retrieval of Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Archaeological Material Culture. Part II. Manual for Identification and Classification*. The Museum, Michigan State University, East Lansing. Submitted to the National Park Service, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia.
- Crump, Nancy C.
1981 Hopewell During World War I: “The Toughest Town North of Hell.” *Virginia Cavalcade* 31(1):38–47.
- de Hart, S. A.
1957 *A Colonial History of Prince George County, Virginia*. Master’s thesis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Deetz, James
1993 Flowerdew Hundred: The Archaeology of a Virginia Plantation, 1619–1864. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Dent, Richard F., Jr.
1995 *Chesapeake Prehistory: Old Traditions, New Directions*. Plenum Press, New York.
- Doran, Michael F.
1987 *Atlas of County Boundary Changes in Virginia, 1634–1895*. Iberian Publishing Company, Athens, Georgia.
- Du Pont de Nemours Company
1918 Map of Hopewell Works, November 8, 1918. Copy on file, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.
- Egloff, Keith T.
1989 *Native American Sites in a Fall Line Transition Study Area*. Research Reports Series No. 5. Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond.
- Eppes Family Muniments
1722–1948 Eppes Family Muniments. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.
- Gilliam, Charles Edgar
1942 “Harrican” in Colonial Virginia Records. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 50(4):337–344.
- Gleach, Frederic W.
1985 A Compilation of Radiocarbon Dates with Applicability to Central Virginia. *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archeological Society of Virginia* 40(4):180–200.
- Haile, E. W. (editor)
1998 *Jamestown Narratives, Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony, The First Decade: 1607–1617*. RoundHouse, Champlain, Virginia.
- Henry, E. L.
1864 City Point, Virginia, Headquarters of General Grant. Original painting in the collection of Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts.

- Hill Directory Co., Inc.
1917 *Hopewell and City Point (Virginia) Directory*. Hill Directory Co., Inc., Richmond, Virginia.
- Holmes, E. P.
1950 *The Disadvantages of Being a Preacher's Son*. Privately published, Winston Salem, North Carolina.
- Jensen, Todd L.
2000 "Gimmie Shelter": Union Shelters of the Civil War, A Preliminary Archaeological Typology. "Gimmie Shelter": Union Shelters of the Civil War, A Preliminary Archaeological Typology. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Jones, David L., Ian A. Rodihan, Louis E. Cullipher, John W. Clay and Michael J. Marks
1985 *Soil Survey of Prince George County, Virginia*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.
- Kelso, William M., Nicholas M. Lucchetti, Beverly A. Straube
1997 *Jamestown Rediscovery III*. Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, Richmond, Virginia.
- Kennard, Edward
1865 *Transatlantic Sketches, Or Sixty Days in America*. Sampson, Low, Son & Co., London. In the collection of the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.
- Kingsbury, Susan Myra (compiler)
1906-1935 *Records of the Virginia Company of London*. 4 vols. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Lutz, Francis Earle
1957 *The Prince George-Hopewell Story*. The William Byrd Press, Inc., Richmond.
- McBride, W. Stephen, Susan C. Andrews, and Sean P. Coughlin
2000 "For the Convenience and Comforts of the Soldiers and Employees at the Depot": Archaeology of the Owens' House/Post Office Complex, Camp Nelson, Kentucky. In *Archaeological Perspectives on the American Civil War*, edited by Clarence R. Geier and Stephen R. Potter, pp. 99-124. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- McCartney, Martha W.
1999 An Early Census Reprinted. *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archeological Society of Virginia* 54(4):178-196.
- McIlwaine, H. R. (editor)
1915 *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1619-1658/59*. The Colonial Press, E. Wadley Co., Richmond, Virginia.
- Martin, Joseph
1836 *A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia, and the District of Columbia...* Printed for Joseph Martin by Moseley & Tompkins, Printers, Charlottesville.
- Meyer, Virginia M., and John F. Dorman (editors)
1987 *Adventurers of Purse and Person, 1607-1624/25*. Dietz Press, Richmond.
- Michler, Nathaniel
1867 Map of Bermuda Hundred. Copy on file, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.
- Nicholls, Michael L.
1981 "In the Light of Human Beings": Richard Eppes and His Island Plantation Code of Laws. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 89:67-78.
- Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies
1895 *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Vol. 46, part III. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Prince George Legislative Petition
1844 Map of City Point. In Prince George Legislative Petition 15 January 18454. On file, Library of Virginia, Richmond.
- Pillow, E. A., and B. F. Pillow
1856 This map represents a tract of land lying in the County of Prince George being a part of the old City Point tract... Plat in collections of the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.
- Reps, John W.
1972 *Tidewater Towns: City Planning in Colonial Virginia and Maryland*. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; distributed by the University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

- Quartermaster General's Office
1865 Rough Sketch of City Point Showing Location of Buildings, Wharves &c., Copied in Q.M.G.O., June 28, 1865. Copy on file, City of Hopewell.
- Roberts, Chad, and C. M. Bailey
2003 Coastal Plain Province. *The Geology of Virginia*. Department of Geology, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. <<http://www.wm.edu/geology/virginia/>>.
- Smith, John
1624 Virginia. Discovered and Discribed by Captayn John Smith, 1606. Graven by William Hole. 6th state. In *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles*. London. Library of Congress digital i.d. g3880 ct000377 urn:hdl:loc.gmd/g3880.ct000377 <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gmd/g3880.ct000377>.
- Stuck, Kenneth E., Dennis B. Blanton, Charles M. Downing, Veronica L. Deitrick, Gregory J. Brown, Susan T. Andrews and Joanne Bowen
1997 *Four Thousand Years on the Appomattox: Archaeological Data Recovery at Site 44PG381, Associated with the Route 10 Bridge Widening, Prince George County, Virginia*. Technical Report Series No. 24. William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Williamsburg, Virginia. Submitted to Virginia Department of Transportation, Richmond.
- Tindall, R.
1608 The Draught by Robarte Tindall of Virginia Anno: 1608. Copy on file, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Trudeau, Noah Andre
1991 *The Last Citadel: Petersburg, Virginia, June 1864–April 1865*. Little, Brown, and Company, Boston.
- Tyler, Lyon G.
1959 *Narratives of Early Virginia, 1606–1625*. Barnes and Noble, Inc., New York. Reprinted. Originally published 1907, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- United States, Congress, Senate
1828 *Journal of the Executive Proceedings of the Senate of the United States of America, 1805-1815, from the Commencement of the First, to the Termination of the Nineteenth Congress, Vol. 2*. Printed by order of the Senate of the United States, by Duff Green, Washington, D.C.
- 1887 *Journal of the Executive Proceedings of the Senate of the United States of America, from December 6, 1841, to March 20, 1845, Inclusive, Vol. 6*. Printed by order of the Senate of the United States, by U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Geological Survey
1994 Hopewell, VA quadrangle. 7.5-minute digital orthophoto series. USGS, Reston, Virginia.
- Vingboons, Johannes
ca. 1639 Caert vande Rivier Powhatan Geleg in Niew Nederlandt. Published by the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, Richmond.
- Virginia Gazette*
1772 *Virginia Gazette*, Purdie and Dixon, 2 April 1772, p. 3, col. 2.
- 1773 *Virginia Gazette*, Purdie and Dixon, 1 April 1773, p. 3, col. 2.
- Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission
1978 National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form. Copy on file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond.
- Weaver, C. E. (compiler)
ca. 1916 *Sketches of Hopewell, The Wonder City: Hopewell, Prince George Co., Virginia—Pen and Picture Sketches*. Central Publishing Company, Inc., Richmond.
- West, Neal
2001 "Wade Hampton and the Great Beefsteak Raid." *The Unknown Civil War*. <<http://www.unknowncivilwar.com/beefsteak%20raid.htm>>

Works Progress Administration of Virginia

- 1936 City Point. In Historical Inventory Project, Counties: Prince George, Class: Cities and Towns. Copies available from Library of Virginia, Richmond.
- 1937a City Point's First Post Office Site. In Historical Inventory Project, Counties: Prince George, Class: Historic Houses. Copies available from Library of Virginia, Richmond.
- 1937b "Tavern Lot", An Old Tavern Site. In Historical Inventory Project, Counties: Prince George, Class: Hotels, Taverns. Copies available from Library of Virginia, Richmond.

Writers' Program

- 1939 *A Guide to Prince George and Hopewell*. American Guide Series. Writers' Program, Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency, Washington, D.C.